



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2007

No. 48

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MALONEY of New York).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 20, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CAROLYN B. MALONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

### IRAN'S MANIPULATION IN IRAQ

Mr. STEARNS. Members of the House, Senate and the media should obviously be aware that Iran, a neighbor that shares decades of vibrant history with Iraq, is heavily involved in shaping the future of Iraq through illegal activities.

The president of the Strategic Policy Consulting company here in Washington, DC; Mr. Jafarzadeh, recently stated, "Al-Quds Force of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards is stepping up terrorism and encouraging sec-

tarian violence in Iraq." Now this is a man to listen to when it comes to Iran. He is the Iranian dissident who first revealed the existence of the clandestine nuclear sites in Iran in August 2002. He says that Iran's goal is to create insecurity to compel coalition forces to leave in order to establish an Islamic theocracy in Iraq.

Iranian forces have been heavily involved in sending arms, ammunition, IED materials, training militia and sending its own intelligence agents into Iraq since 2003. My colleagues, it is a sad twist of irony; Al-Quds now coordinates insurgent attacks on our forces in Iraq from the national headquarters in Iran out of the old U.S. Embassy building, the same building where American diplomats were held for those horrific 444 days that began in the year 1979.

One of five Iranians arrested by U.S. forces in a raid on Iran's consulate in a city in northern Iraq on January 11 was an envoy of the former Iranian President. The man, Mr. Sharoudi, is wanted in Austria on charges that he took part in the assassination of an Iranian Kurdish leader and his aids in Vienna in 1989. This historic leader of Iranian Kurds was killed in an apartment in the outskirts of Vienna when he was scheduled to meet a delegation from Iran. According to the Austrian police, the killer escaped arrest by hiding in Iran's embassy in Vienna. Austrian sources claim that the Iranian president, Ahmadinejad, was the logistics head of the commando groups responsible for the Kurdish leader's death, and Sharoudi was one of the killers. It is curious, then, that this same man was recently found operating with four other Iranians in northern Iraq.

There is also an Al-Quds force in Iraq under the command of Mehdi Mohandes. According to a recent Washington Times article, it was Mohandes who was responsible for the attacks on the U.S. and the U.K. embassies in Ku-

wait in the eighties. Interpol placed Mohandes on a wanted list in 1984, and since then Mohandes has remained inside Iran's borders—until now. The new terror network which he commands in Iraq is curiously named Hezbollah, a deliberate linkage to Lebanon's own terror movement with which Mohandes has connections. The Iraqi network operates in Basra and Baghdad. Members are trained in military and terror tactics in Basra, and they receive armed shipments there that were smuggled across the border from Iran.

To maintain this network, obviously it is expensive, has a huge cost. According to the Washington Times article again, Brigadier General Abtahi of the Iranian Revolutionary Forces in southern Iran send millions and millions of dollars from a small border town in Iran into Iraq every month. My colleagues, we have little hope of success in Iraq if we neglect to address this growing interference by Iran.

In related news, the Iraqi President has changed his stance and has publicly pledged to fight terror and insurgent groups within Iraq, whether they are Sunni or whether they are Shi'a, which includes the Sadr militia. In turn, this has motivated Sadr forces to end the boycott from the Iraqi government, a move towards greater participation in the political process there. My colleagues, it is a hopeful sign that perhaps with greater political participation, the popular support of the terrorists in the Shia community will decline.

We must maintain this diplomatic and military pressure against these terrorist groups and on the Iraqi government to fight them. There is no hope of success in Iraq as long as Iran is allowed free reign to interfere and despoil the Iraqi government's efforts.

I support the President's acknowledgement of this growing threat and urge him and my colleagues in Congress to work together to provide the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2673

material support to our service men and women on the ground they need to combat it.

#### NATION'S LOOMING FINANCIAL CRISIS NEEDS A BIPARTISAN SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, as a nation, we are moving closer and closer to the edge of the financial cliff. A few steps forward and we will start the free fall into a canyon of debt which is bad for our country.

The baby boomers start retiring at the end of this year, and that will bring unprecedented levels of entitlement and other program spending. If left unchanged, in just a few decades there will be little money left for transportation, education, health care, medical research, cancer research, veterans, the environment, and all the other important programs. We cannot continue to keep borrowing and mortgaging our future to countries like China that carry our debt.

Young people should be clamoring for Congress to act; they have the most to lose from our inaction. It is their future that is being mortgaged, and every day we don't act we increase the debt burden they must repay in the future.

I have a bill which offers an opportunity to change the current course. Senator VOINOVICH and I first introduced the SAFE Commission last summer, and we reintroduced it in January.

Our country is in trouble, and we cannot afford to wait much longer. The bipartisan SAFE Commission will put everything on the table, entitlements and other Federal spending and tax policies, as it comes up with recommendations. It will hold town hall meetings across the country to explain the financial crisis we face and discuss the issue with the American people. I believe the American people, given the hard facts from a bipartisan panel, will understand that solving this problem will take some sacrifice from everyone.

The commission's recommendations would then come to Congress and we would take an up or down vote on the proposals in their entirety, similar to the BRAC process. Mandating congressional action on the panel's recommendations is what makes this unique.

There is also an opportunity for Congress to put forward an alternative proposal to reach the same goals at the same time the SAFE Commission recommendations are voted on. Holding out some hope that Congress would act on its own, the legislation also has a provision that if Congress were to pass a measure making substantive changes in entitlement spending and taking other action to get our financial house

in order, the commission would cease to exist. But if Congress doesn't act no later than 17 months from the organization of the commission, it would be required to vote up or down on the SAFE Commission.

I have written a number of Dear Colleagues and personally talked with a number of my House colleagues about joining this effort. While 20 Republicans have signed on, including minority leader JOHN BOEHNER, this effort has fallen on deaf ears on the other side of the aisle. I have personally sent a letter to each Blue Dog Coalition member appealing to them to step forward and join me in focusing national attention on this critical crisis. I have a history of working in a bipartisan way in this panel, and yet I hear absolutely no support or interest from the other side of the aisle.

I have also written to media and public opinions and leaders about this issue over the year. I certainly understand how the issue is competing with other national priorities, including the war in Iraq, but I fear that if we can't get Congress to move this year, there will not be another opportunity for a couple of years, with the 2008 presidential campaign heating up. This is a moral issue that this Congress is not addressing.

As a father of five children and a grandfather of 12, the fiscal challenges facing the Nation with the baby boomers retiring strike me as much more than a routine policy discussion. Without action, what kind of future are we leaving to our children and our grandchildren? In a word, "bleak." We owe a debt to previous generations, to our parents and our grandparents for the sacrifices that they made for our country to make our country so great. Likewise, our generation, those who serve in this Congress and serve in the administration, must find the resolve so that generations to come will have the same type of financial future that our parents and grandparents gave to us.

I ask Members of Congress to look at this and join in a bipartisan way to deal with this issue in this Congress. And I also urge the administration, which has been silent on this issue, to stop, to break the silence. And for Rob Portman and the Secretary of Treasury and others to come up here and support this so we can make sure that we give our children and our grandchildren the same opportunities that our mothers and fathers gave to us.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, full of goodness and wisdom, guide this government, business executives and all Your people in their daily decisions, especially those which have to do with money.

Lord, before You does money have any meaning? Certainly money can never be the measure of a person's true worth. Before You, money cannot even be an index of a generous heart. Why, then, is money so important to Your people? And how will they be judged by You? Does money itself dull human perceptions and put an end to dependency on others? Are You not the Almighty? Then why do people think they can solve their problems themselves only with more money?

As people pray, do they imagine You can help them only by giving them money? Do they believe You do not care how or why they spend money? If water is the sign of life, and a crust of bread or a bowl of rice can symbolize human hunger, what is the meaning of money? Does money really talk? In the United States the dollar bill says "In God we trust." So be it now and forever. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL GUARD

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, next month the Virgin Islands National Guard is scheduled to deploy another 100 soldiers to Iraq. Already over 400 have served several tours of duty; of that 100 to be deployed, 36 are women.

We in the Virgin Islands have lost a total of seven soldiers, five Virgin Islanders, and two whose families moved there. Having just lost two of our finest, the first VI National Guard to be killed in Iraq, that April deployment will be a very difficult one not just for the families, but for the entire community. I want to be able to go with a message of hope.

This week we will be debating the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act. This bill sets a reasonable timeline for troop withdrawal, ensures funding needed to ensure that our troops are trained, protected and equipped while in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that they are properly cared for when they return.

Colleagues, this is an important bill; our country needs us to pass it. I want that when the April deployment ceremony comes about, I can meet my VI National Guard knowing that they will not be there for more than one tour, that they will have what they need to get the job done, that they will come home in a time certain, and that all the services they need will be there for them when they return. That is a message that will make all the difference in the world to them and their families.

### IMPROVING NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, common sense says the closer you are to the problem, the better you are able to address it. Unfortunately, No Child Left Behind seems to say the opposite. It says that if you are a bureaucrat in Washington, you understand the needs of public education across America better than anyone else does. Educators, however, know that that is not the case.

After meeting with dozens of teachers, principals and administrators in my district, I am convinced that it is time to give our States a choice. That is why I am supporting the A-PLUS Act introduced last week. The bill would allow States to opt out of the burdensome regulations attached to No Child Left Behind; it would let local leaders decide how best to spend their Federal education dollars; and it would allow the challenges we face in public education to be addressed by those who understand them best, local educators. I urge support for the A-PLUS Act.

### SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS WHEN THEY COME HOME

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FILNER. The verdict is in, my colleagues. Both the Defense Department's health services for returning troops and the Veterans Administration are strained to the limit; they are almost to the breaking point. For as much money that we give them, we have not prepared for the influx of the troops from Iraq and Afghanistan. The evidence is clear.

What was happening at Walter Reed that was outlined in the Washington Post has, in fact, educated the whole Nation. We have had cover stories in the news magazines on how veterans are falling through the cracks. There was an incredible documentary on ABC News by Bob Woodruff and how his brain injury was treated and how fellow vets had their brain injuries treated. And yesterday on CNN we had a story on how Iraqi troops returning were homeless already.

We simply have got to meet this test as a Nation. The Democrats are trying to do that. We put an additional \$3.6 billion into the continuing resolution to fund this year to help our troops. And in the supplemental we have \$3.5 billion for our Nation's troops. It is time to support our troops when they come home.

### FINISH IT

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, there are a lot of clever words for quitting in Iraq: withdrawal, realignment, redeployment, the terms go on and on.

The cloud of defeatism grows larger and larger in Washington, D.C. Numerous pieces of legislation have been introduced in this House, from outright retreat and withdrawal to letting Congress become the generals of the war.

Taking money from the war effort leaves our troops there at risk. There seems to be three alternatives: retreat with defeat; stalemate, which seems to be the current situation of fighting not to lose; or, three, supply more troops to the ones that are there so they can finish the job and then come home. The third choice seems to be the wisest.

Congress tried to tie the pursestrings in the Vietnam War. Congress tried to prematurely bring the troops home in Vietnam, and we know the results in Vietnam. We fought that war as if not to lose it.

It is in the best interest of the United States to help our military finish their mission in Iraq and stabilize Iraq before we leave.

And that's just the way it is.

### DEMOCRATS HOLD THE IRAQI GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABLE FOR PROMISES THEY MADE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, over the past year, the Iraqi Government has made countless promises to the Bush administration, but they have yet to live up to them. Military generals and experts have already concluded that there is no military solution to the civil war, and that the only way to cut down on violence there is through political and diplomatic channels.

While President Bush addressed the Nation to announce his troop escalation plan, he promised America, and I quote, "America will hold the Iraqi Government to the benchmarks it has announced." A newly released Pentagon report concludes that the Iraqi Government is still not living up to the promises it made last year. The Iraqi Prime Minister vowed to reform his government, beginning with his cabinet and his ministers, but the Pentagon report says that not one of these steps has been taken.

It is time for Congress finally to hold the Iraqi Government accountable. If the Prime Minister is not committed to following through on his promises he made to our President, then it is only fair for us to reevaluate our commitment to them. The day of an open-ended war is over.

### RECOGNIZING SUCCESS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, our new strategy in Iraq is working. Just last week, General David Petraeus, commander of the coalition forces in Iraq, gave his first briefing regarding the situation on the ground. Specifically, General Petraeus reported that the Iraqis are fulfilling their obligations, having sent 10 Army brigades and nine police brigades into Baghdad.

The Iraqi Government has unshackled U.S. forces, allowing them to target both Shiite and Sunni militias. Numerous weapons reserves have been uncovered, car bomb factories have been destroyed, and top al Qaeda members have been captured. Unfortunately, too many of my colleagues refuse to acknowledge these successes. Some have lost sight of the most important factor, achieving victory. Al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri has declared Iraq and Afghanistan the central front in the global war on terrorism. As the parent of an Iraqi service veteran, I know we must win to protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

□ 1215

## BALANCING BUDGET WITHOUT RAISING TAXES

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, this is the first year that the Democrats have controlled Congress in a long time, and we are dedicated to bringing a budget to the floor next week that balances the budget within the next 5 years without any new taxes.

Earlier this year, the President made the same pledge. Unfortunately, earlier this month the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released its analysis of the President's budget and says that it falls short by 2012. Since taking office, this has been a difficult proposed budget.

Not only does the President's budget remain in the red for the next 5 years, but he also proposes raising taxes on some of the middle-class families. The President's health care proposal would result in a tax increase of \$500 billion over 10 years by increasing taxes on middle-class families who are fortunate to have employer-provided health insurance.

Madam Speaker, Democrats propose a budget that is balanced by 2012, and a budget that is balanced without raising taxes.

## AMERICANS WANT A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week the Budget Committee will mark up the budget for fiscal year 2008. The American people want a balanced budget that lowers spending, reforms unsustainable entitlement programs, and encourages economic growth without raising taxes.

My constituents are tired of the out-of-control spending that they see at the Federal level. That is why I stood with my colleagues in the fiscally responsible Republican Study Committee last week and announced the Taxpayer Bill of Rights. We believe that the taxpayers have a right to a Federal Government that does not grow beyond their ability to pay for it. They have the right to receive back each dollar that they entrust to the government for their retirement; a right to a simple, fair Tax Code they can understand; and they have a right to expect that the government balance its budget without having to raise taxes.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working in a bipartisan way with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to ensure that the rights of the taxpayer are not ignored.

## SUPPLEMENTAL PROVIDES CRITICAL FUNDING

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, we were all outraged by stories of how wounded soldiers are being treated at hospitals all over our Nation and how many are forced to weave through bureaucratic hurdles to receive the benefits they were promised.

We cannot continue to neglect the needs of our veterans and our soldiers wounded in combat. That is why the Democratic emergency supplemental bill provides substantial funding increases for equipment that will better protect our troops in the field and the necessary assistance to meet our obligation to help those who were wounded.

The Democratic supplemental bill provides \$313 million more for new vehicles called mine resistant ambush protection vehicles, which will resist improvised explosive devices. Our bill also provides critical funding for soldiers suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injuries.

Madam Speaker, the Democratic emergency spending bill shows a real commitment to both our soldiers still in the field and our troops wounded in combat. It deserves our support.

## NO TO DEMOCRAT TAX INCREASE

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, soon our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be introducing their 2008 budget. What they will really be introducing is an unprecedented tax hike on the American people.

Under the economic policies of the last 6 years, the American people have led this economy to over 40 straight months of economic growth, over 7 million new jobs and an unemployment rate at a near-40-year low. This is proof that Americans respond best to having more of their money in their pockets.

Nevertheless, the majority party, true to form, is preparing to usher in the largest tax increase in history. That's right, the largest tax increase in history that would bring back the marriage penalty and discourage further investment and growth. This would be a huge step backwards for our economy and for our government. The American people deserve leadership that respects their hard work. Washington must stop trying to find ways to afford a larger government.

As we begin the debate on the budget for the upcoming year, we shouldn't begin with a plan to grow an even more massive bureaucracy on the backs of the American taxpayer.

## MORE ACCOUNTABILITY IN ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. MURPHY Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, last week this House, with strong bipartisan support, passed important bills that will demand more transparency and accountability here in Washington. And in the first few months of this Congress, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on which I have the opportunity to serve, has held several hearings on political influence in public policy.

Sadly, instead of following our lead, the Bush administration is being anything but open about its involvement in the political purging of eight U.S. Attorneys.

For weeks now, Attorney General Gonzales has asserted that the firings were not instigated by the White House, but e-mails between the White House and Gonzales's chief of staff show heavy involvement in the purging by political advisers.

The President admits mistakes were made, but he has no plans to hold his Attorney General accountable. The implications of this scandal on our legal system are grave. This administration has created a climate in which prosecutors are looking over their shoulders trying to do right by the political bosses instead of through the system of justice.

Madam Speaker, this White House should learn something from what we did in the House last week. It is past time that the President insist on more accountability in his administration.

## FUND TROOPS IN HARM'S WAY

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, you know, in Texas we have a phrase for folks who talk big game and fail to deliver. We call it "all sizzle and no steak."

That's sort of how I view the Members of Congress who claim they support our men and women in uniform, but fail to back permanent legislation that says Congress will fully fund our troops serving in harm's way.

Their actions don't match their words. If Members really support the brave men and women in our armed services, Members would make sure our men and women in combat have the bullets and tanks and helmets, whatever they need.

That is why today I am launching a discharge petition on my bill to fully

fund all our troops in harm's way. The Democrats can't hide behind their slow-bleed strategy forever. We need a floor vote to make the entire Congress go on record for or against our troops.

#### IRAQIS MUST MEET BENCHMARKS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, American involvement in Iraq should not be an open-ended proposition, and we should not be sending more troops there to serve as referees in that nation's devastating civil war.

The status quo simply cannot continue. It is time this Congress seriously level with the Iraqi Government that it must meet the benchmarks the President himself outlined earlier this year. And if they cannot meet those benchmarks, it is time to start bringing our troops home.

It is time the Iraqi Government is held accountable for its actions. The Maliki government must realize that it has to meet political, economic and diplomatic benchmarks in the region, and that if serious improvements are not seen in the coming months, then we will begin the process of redeploying our troops out of Iraq.

This week, we will have an opportunity to exert pressure on the Iraqi Government to meet the President's own benchmarks. If the Iraqi Government continues to believe that our involvement there is indefinite, what kind of pressure are they going to have to make the necessary reforms? They are not, and that's why this change in direction is much needed at this time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARMAN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

#### HONORING HEROIC SERVICE OF GLIDER PILOTS OF UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 42) honoring the heroic service and sacrifice of the 6,500 glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 42

Whereas the use of gliders during World War II provided an innovative method of transporting troops and equipment behind enemy lines;

Whereas the United States Army Air Forces began training glider pilots in 1942, eventually training thousands of men;

Whereas glider pilots exhibited exceptional valor by landing behind enemy lines in unarmed gliders;

Whereas glider pilots participated in 8 successful missions;

Whereas in Operation Husky, which took place in Sicily on July 9, 1943, glider pilots carried British airborne troops, completing their mission despite heavy casualties resulting from landings at sea;

Whereas in Operation Broadway, which took place in Burma on March 5, 1944, glider pilots took the Japanese completely by surprise; carried troops, airborne engineers, and equipment by night; seized and prepared landing strips for forthcoming transport planes; and evacuated the wounded, accomplishing in 2 hours what would have taken 2 months by ambulance;

Whereas in Operation Overlord, on June 6, 1944, glider pilots took part in the Battle of Normandy, the largest combined airborne and seaborne invasion in history, carrying troops of the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions and their equipment to landing areas behind enemy lines;

Whereas in Operation Dragoon, which took place in the coastal area of southern France on August 15, 1944, glider pilots delivered troops and cargo despite wooden poles erected in open fields to impede their landing;

Whereas in Operation Market-Garden, the largest glider operation of World War II, which took place in Holland on September 17, 1944, glider pilots carried their usual cargo of troops and heavy equipment, thereby providing cover for an attempt to clear a road to Berlin;

Whereas in Operation Repulse, which took place in Bastogne on December 27, 1944, as part of the Battle of the Bulge, glider pilots, although flying directly through enemy fire, were able to land every glider, delivering the badly needed ammunition, gasoline, and medical supplies that enabled defenders against the German offensive to persevere and secure the ultimate victory;

Whereas in Operation Varsity, which took place at the Rhine crossing in Wesel, Germany, on March 24, 1945, more than 1,300 glider pilots took part in their final European mission, delivering a fatal blow to Axis forces;

Whereas in Operation Gypsy Task Force-Appari Mission, which took place in the Philippine island of Luzon on June 23, 1945, glider pilots took part in their final, and only Pacific, mission, carrying members of the 11th Airborne Division; and

Whereas many glider pilots sacrificed their lives during the course of these missions: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) honors the heroic service and sacrifice of the glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II; and

(2) urges the people of the United States to remember and teach future generations about the contributions and sacrifices that glider pilots, and all veterans, have made to and for the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 42, which honors the heroic service of glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for bringing this measure forward.

The resolution recognizes the more than 20,000 individuals who volunteered and were trained to serve as glider pilots during World War II. These brave men served alongside airborne forces and participated in many of the major invasions: Sicily, Burma, the Battle of Normandy, France, Holland, Germany, the Philippines, and the Battle of the Bulge. These unarmed gliders landed behind enemy lines transporting vital troops and equipment to support the Allied Forces.

Major General Henry "Hap" Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Corps, directed the development of a transport glider program, and the United States military glider program officially began on February 25, 1941. These gliders provided the Army Air Corps with a unique ability to transport soldiers and equipment that could not be reached by conventional ground units.

By the end of 1942, the Army Air Force had graduated a total of 9,802 glider pilots. Within just 3 years, the United States had 21,240 military glider pilots available, according to the Army Air Forces Statistical Digest of World War II. Less than 3 years after the first graduating class of glider pilots had finished their training, these fearless pilots flew numerous combat teams into France on D-Day. Gliders transported 12 to 15 fully equipped soldiers and four portable machine guns with 500 rounds of ammunition for each gun.

Unfortunately, the American military glider pilots are a vanishing breed. The Department of Defense ended the military glider program in 1952. Today, we are here to honor these daring and fearless World War II glider pilots for their services and sacrifices and to urge all Americans to remember the significant contribution that they made on behalf of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 42, a bill to honor a

group of servicemembers who are oftentimes forgotten, the glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces.

The United States Army Air Force began training glider pilots in 1942. These exceptional men provided an innovative and silent method of transporting troops and equipment in unarmed gliders during World War II, built of fragile balsa wood.

As the son of a member of the Fourteenth Air Force during World War II who served with the Flying Tigers in China, I especially appreciate the courageous airmen.

The glider pilots, along with airborne forces, participated in eight successful missions, landing behind enemy lines in their unarmed gliders in Sicily, Normandy, southern France, Holland, Bastogne, Rhine Crossing, Luzon in the Philippines, and Burma.

□ 1230

During Operation Husky, which took place in Sicily on July 9, 1943, glider pilots carried British airborne troops, completing their mission despite heavy casualties resulting from landings at sea.

In Operation Broadway, which took place in Burma on March 5, 1944, glider pilots took the Japanese completely by surprise; carried troops, airborne engineers and equipment by night; seized and prepared landing strips for forthcoming transport planes; and evacuated the wounded, accomplishing in 2 hours what would have taken 2 months by ambulance.

Operation Overlord, D-Day, on June 6, 1944, glider pilots took part in the Battle of Normandy, the largest combined airborne and seaborne invasion in history, carrying troops of the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions and their equipment to landing areas behind enemy lines during the D-Day liberation.

Tragically, many heroic glider pilots were killed as the hedgerows of Normandy of D-Day were actually rock walls that instantly destroyed the gliders. A survivor of the glider invasion was the legendary major, J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who was elected to the U.S. Senate, achieving the age of 100 while still in office.

During Operation Dragoon, which took place in the coastal area of southern France on August 15, 1944, glider pilots delivered troops and cargo despite wooden poles erected in open fields to impede their landings.

Operation Market-Garden, the largest glider operation of World War II, took place in Holland on September 17, 1944. Glider pilots carried their usual cargo of troops and heavy equipment, thereby providing cover for an attempt to clear a road to Berlin.

In Operation Repulse, which took place in Bastogne on December 27, 1944, as part of the Battle of the Bulge, glider pilots, although flying directly through enemy fire, were able to land every glider, delivering badly needed ammunition, gasoline and medical sup-

plies that enabled defenders against the German offensive to persevere and secure the ultimate victory.

America did not redeploy in the Ardennes offensive, but it stood with resolve for victory.

Operation Varsity, which took place at the Rhine crossing in Wesel, Germany, on March 24, 1945, more than 1,300 glider pilots took part in their final European mission, delivering a fatal blow to the Axis forces.

The gliders' final, and only, Pacific mission took place in the Philippine island of Luzon, Philippines, on June 23, 1945. In Operation Gypsy Task Force-Appari mission, glider pilots carried members of the 11th Airborne Division.

In the words of one pilot, "Imagine flying a motorless, fabric-covered CG-4A glider, violently bouncing and jerking on a 11/16-inch nylon rope 350 feet back of the C-47 tow plane. You see the nervous glider infantrymen behind you, some vomiting, many in prayer, as you hedge-hop along at tree-top level instinctively jumping up in your seat every time you hear bullets and flak tearing through the glider. You try not to think about the explosives aboard. It's like flying a stick of dynamite through the gates of Hell."

Madam Speaker, we must not forget the sacrifices these pilots made for the betterment of our country and the world. Let us remember and honor the heroic service and the sacrifices made by the glider pilots. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 42 and commend Congresswoman MCCARTHY for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would like to thank some of my colleagues who have been instrumental in getting this legislation to the floor today. Chairman SKELTON of the Armed Services has done a tremendous job. We were under a lot of pressure to try and have the bill on the floor today, and I appreciate everything that he has done. Also, my good friend Congresswoman NANCY BOYDA and Congressman JOE WILSON have been great friends to the glider pilots, and I thank you both for the issues that you have been fighting for.

We are here today to honor the glider pilots of the World War II. Glider planes were lightweight aircraft without engines that were used to drop supplies and reinforcement personnel for troops and surveillance. They were effective because they made no noise, and they could fly into enemy areas undetected.

The gliders would be towed by larger planes in order to take off, but then would fly and land on their own. The glider pilots flew dangerous missions

and were constantly at risk of being shot down.

We have heard in the past that some of these pilots that volunteered to be glider pilots were suicidal. They were not. They wanted to fly, and they wanted to be part of protecting this Nation. So they became glider pilots because that was the only way they were going to get into the air at that particular time.

Glider pilots were instrumental in the invasion of Normandy on D-Day, despite the fact that pilots had to improvise where to land, since no appropriate landing strips were known to be behind enemy lines. Later in the war, Germans would plant wooden poles in open fields to prevent glider pilots from landing.

The U.S. Army Air Forces began training glider pilots in 1941. The program quickly grew during the war. Eventually, thousands of men were trained to be glider pilots.

Throughout World War II, the glider pilots flew many successful missions. The glider pilots' first mission occurred on July 19, 1943. Operation Husky, which it was called, called for glider pilots to carry British airborne troops into Sicily. Despite the heavy casualties from landing at sea, the glider pilots did complete their mission.

In March of 1944, the glider pilots completed Operation Broadway in Burma. The glider pilots took the Japanese completely by surprise, carrying troops, airborne engineers and equipment by night. They seized and prepared landing strips for forthcoming transport planes to evacuate the wounded.

When you think about World War II and you think about the equipment that these glider planes were carrying and how they were able to accomplish this feat as far as making roadways for wounded, they did it in 2 hours, in 2 hours. Completing a mission like that would have taken much, much longer. Usually a trip like that to the front lines to get the wounded back would have taken so much longer by ambulance.

Perhaps the most famous mission of the glider pilots was the Battle of Normandy. On D-Day, the glider pilots participated in the largest combined airborne and seaborne invasion in history. They carried troops of the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions and their equipment to landing areas behind enemy lines. Their work helped to secure victory in World War II.

Madam Speaker, each year we lose more and more of these courageous veterans. We are lucky enough to have a glider pilot in the gallery with us today. His name is Michael Samek, and he is the gentleman that asked me to do whatever I could to recognize the glider pilots. I believe Congress must recognize their accomplishments for future generations.

When you think about even the war today that we have, so many of our

young men and women and many people are coming home, and they are veterans. From the beginning of time, we have honored our veterans, and I am sure that we are going to find many other veterans that we have not honored, and I hope the committees will honor each and every one of them as time goes on.

But that is why I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 42. This bill recognizes the glider pilots and the many troops who put their lives on the line to defend the ideas and the freedoms of this country.

All of the glider missions were successful. Unfortunately, casualties were still suffered.

Earlier today, "Silent Wings," a DVD on these brave men, was released. Robert Childs, who was the director who became interested in glider pilots, started working on this project almost 11 years ago. I will be sponsoring the screening of the film tonight for all Members and staff. These events help to truly honor the sacrifices and bravery of the glider pilots.

I hope you will all join me in celebrating with these veterans. We must remember and teach future generations about the sacrifices that glider pilots and all our veterans made for our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the glider pilots and to vote for H. Con. Res. 42.

Again, I will say there is not enough that we can do for the men and women certainly of past generations and for this generation that support our country, fight for our country to give us our freedom, and for that, I truly am honored to be able to sponsor this resolution.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, again I want to congratulate Congresswoman MCCARTHY for her obvious appreciation of the veterans of World War II, her obvious sincerity for the veterans of World War II. We are so grateful that we have present today veterans who are the greatest generation. With my six visits to Iraq and twice to Afghanistan, I have seen the new greatest generation, and again, I want to congratulate Congresswoman MCCARTHY for her leadership and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 42.

Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back my time.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, we are very, very fortunate today to have one of these courageous glider pilots with us in the gallery, and I would like to take this opportunity to ask him to stand and to have us give him our recognition, please. Michael Samek is in the gallery, and we thank you so much for your courageous contributions to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order under the rules to draw attention to persons in the gallery.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend

and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Kansas and, of course, my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, for introducing this resolution.

I was here on the floor doing 1-minute, and then I started to listen to the debate, and I think it is very important that this resolution be introduced for a number of reasons, but I also wanted to relate it, if I could, to my family.

I think that many of the exploits of veterans during World War II, including Air Force veterans, and I know the Army Air Force, that is what they were called then, are kind of unsung. People are not aware of it. People are not necessarily aware of the different units and how they served, and including the Air Force.

I notice that in the resolution she particularly mentions that not only are we honoring the service and sacrifice of the glider pilots, but we are also urging the people of the United States to remember and teach future generations about the contributions and sacrifices that glider pilots and all veterans have made to and for the United States, and I have to relate a story with my own dad.

My father was in the Army Air Force during World War II. He served in the Pacific, and he was a tail gunner with the reconnaissance forces, the planes that came in and took the pictures before I guess the other missions with bombs and other things took place. And for a long time, he is 83 now, for a long time when I was growing up, he would never talk about it, and I could never really understand why. In fact, he would never even want to take an airplane. He apparently served in the Pacific, came back, and went across the country by train instead of using an airplane to get back.

One day, we were down in Washington, and we went to the Air and Space Museum with my son, who is now 11 years old, but then maybe he was 6 or 7 years old. My father all of the sudden started to tell the story about his time during World War II because he saw some of the planes in the Air and Space Museum that were involved in some of those combat operations. It was such a tremendous experience for my son to hear my father talk about his experience during the war with reconnaissance planes and also as a tail gunner. He never told about it in a heroic way; although everyone knows that was a very difficult position. Most of the tail gunners never came back. The majority actually were killed in action, even those that were involved in reconnaissance.

It was such a valuable experience for my son to hear his grandfather talk about that experience in the Army Air Force during World War II.

□ 1245

But I think a lot of the veterans simply don't tell the story. I don't really

know why. I really think that when you draw attention to this, in this case the glider pilots, but there are others, when you draw attention to it and you make it a point that we need to follow up with our veterans and have them tell the story, it really is a very important thing, a lot more than I think a lot of people realize.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. Yes, I will certainly yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. It is so important for those that are watching this when you have veterans out there. We have the oral history of our veterans that is going to the Library of Congress. I know projects that I have been doing back home, we have been working with an awful lot of veterans who were prisoners of war, because what you said earlier is so true.

Veterans need to be remembered for everything that they have done for this Nation, but certainly there are so many veterans out there that are not honored. I just wanted to say that with your words and talking about your father, and I know that our colleague here probably wants to talk about her dad, who was also in the war.

With that, I really appreciate your words, and I really think that all of us should be encouraging our veterans to talk about their experiences so the younger generation does know about it.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate your comments, and, I, again, appreciate the fact that you have introduced this resolution and that we are moving it today.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, my father, again, and it's so good to hear us talk about the generation that has come before us, my father was actually in a submarine in the South Pacific during World War II. Like many of our fathers, mine only recently has begun to really tell us what went on and those experiences as he was fighting for our country back during World War II.

I am so appreciative of my colleague and friend, Mrs. MCCARTHY, for bringing this to our attention. I hope that at some point we can take the same opportunity to honor those who have served in those submarines, not only during World War II, but today. It is a dangerous service and clearly these men love their country and are willing to do what it takes to defend the rights and to keep our country free.

Again, I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York in bringing this bill forward and any support that we can bring to it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 42, as amended.

The question was taken.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1433, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2007

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet this week to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1433, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 21.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as introduced. A copy of that bill is posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1227, GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 254 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate

the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1227 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 254.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 254 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 60 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, and the rule waives all points of order against consider-

ation of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order to provisions of the bill, as amended.

The rule makes in order seven amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report and by the Member designated in the report. The amendments are considered as read, are debatable for the time specified, are not subject to amendment and are not divisible. All points of order against the amendments except, again, those in clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI are waived.

Finally, the rule does provide one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which makes in order nearly all of the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee. Even though many on our side had concerns about the intent and effect of certain provisions in the amendments, the Rules Committee, with the recommendation of the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, voted to allow the House to debate the amendments and let the votes fall as they may.

Besides the manager's amendment, the rule makes in order more Republican amendments, actually, than Democratic ones, four Republican and three Democratic amendments. The few amendments that were not made in order by the rule were either withdrawn, determined to be non germane, or had already been voted on earlier by the House.

The rule also provides extensive time for debate on each amendment so that the House can have a very vigorous discussion on each of them. Under this rule, each of the amendments is debatable for 20 minutes. Two of the amendments are debatable for an hour each.

Chairman FRANK came before our committee and testified that we should allow considerable time to debate each of these amendments on their merits and allow the views of all Members to be heard, even if that meant that we have to work late into the evening.

The Rules Committee agreed with the chairman, and I am pleased to bring forth this very even-handed rule.

Madam Speaker, as you know, Hurricane Katrina made landfall on August 25, 2005, followed by Hurricane Rita on September 24 and Hurricane Wilma on October 24, 2005, causing extraordinarily heavy loss of life and dislocation of thousands of families. Hurricane Katrina alone devastated 90,000



square miles, made 770,000 people homeless and had a death toll of 1,464 in Louisiana alone.

Just by comparison, in 1906 the earthquake and fire in San Francisco killed an estimated 500 to 3,000 people, resulted in about 250,000 people homeless. The Galveston Island flood of 1900 killed as many as 8,000 people, in the island and the city. The Chicago fire, the famous fire of 1871, burned an area of approximately 3 square miles and made 100,000 people homeless.

In the aftermath of the storms, Congress approved \$16.7 billion for Community Development Block Grants, and that's the portion of Katrina aid that we are talking about here, to aid the affected areas with rebuilding efforts. Of that, roughly \$1.2 billion has been spent. There has been a lot of bureaucratic mismanagement, frankly, in FEMA, resulting in the delay of aid approved to the people who need it.

Tragically, many residents continue to be displaced, and the pace of home repair and reconstruction is much slower than had been hoped for. And tens of thousands of federally assisted evacuees from these hurricanes face impending deadlines later this year for continued eligibility for rental assistance. A great number of residents are still scattered around the country, many hundreds of thousands of miles from their homes.

Madam Speaker, we are aware that FEMA didn't get its job done in the aftermath of the hurricane. We are here, in part, to try to put this back together and make certain that the aid people need is delivered. In part, this Congress now is responding to the needs of the folks in the gulf coast again.

I am very pleased to support this rule and support the underlying bill because it does provide some overdue housing relief to displaced gulf coast residents. H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, was passed out of the Financial Services Committee on a strong bipartisan vote of 50-16. The bill is practical in speeding up the repair and rebuilding of homes and affordable rental housing to the displaced low-income victims to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma.

□ 1300

Very specifically, the measure frees up for use \$1.175 billion in funds that was previously made available to the State of Louisiana, but which has been held up by FEMA. Louisiana has proposed combining these funds with other Community Development Block Grant funds under its Road Home program for grants to homeowners, but FEMA won't approve use of the funds, thereby slowing down the program because of concerns about specific provisions of the Road Home program that provide incentives for homeowners to commit to return to the State of Louisiana and live.

This bill would transfer such funds to CDBG grants in order to expedite the

availability of those funds. The bill also has a number of provisions designed to address the shortfall in affordable housing for low-income families. And, as we all know, it was low-income families who bore the brunt of suffering as a result of these hurricanes. This measure would prevent public housing units in New Orleans from being demolished until the Federal Government has a plan to replace them and grant displaced public housing tenants an absolute right of return to either their former neighborhood or one as close as possible.

Faced with a looming September deadline for the cutoff of some 12,000 families currently receiving Disaster Voucher Program assistance, H.R. 1227 extends this deadline through at least the end of the year and authorizes replacement vouchers to affected families when the program terminates, and that would continue as long as the family is eligible for voucher assistance.

Additionally, responding to numerous accounts of government waste in the gulf coast rebuilding process, H.R. 1227 includes a number of provisions to ensure effective oversight. Federal funds must be used efficiently, effectively, and legally. The bill requires the State of Louisiana to submit monthly reports on the progress of the Road Home program in making funds available to homeowners. The bill requires the Government Accountability Office to complete quarterly reports identifying any waste, fraud, and abuse in connection with the program. We have got to stay on top of this money. And the bill requires the GAO study to examine methods of improving the distribution of Federal housing funds to assist States with hurricane recovery efforts.

Finally, the bill authorizes reimbursement of communities and landlords for monies lost through providing assistance to displaced individuals. A number of communities and private sector landlords throughout the country did play a critical role in providing housing assistance to evacuees in the aftermath of the hurricanes. This was crucial at a time when housing was in short supply and hundreds of thousands of families needed that assistance. We want to encourage such actions in future disasters to restore people's faith that the government can be a friend and an ally at a time of extraordinary need.

Much of the gulf coast remains devastated. Residents continue to suffer from inadequate housing, health care, and other basic services. And, more than 1½ years after Hurricane Katrina struck, the situation in the gulf coast remains an emergency. We must act now to right some of the wrongs that have been done and not wait on the sidelines anymore. We urge that you support the rule and the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Vermont, my friend Mr. WELCH, for the time, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

On August 24, 1992, I remember Hurricane Andrew, category 5 storm, devastated my community, with wind gusts of over 200 miles per hour. That storm caused over \$26 billion of damage to south Florida. Entire communities were destroyed. Hurricane Andrew caused 43 deaths, destroyed over 125,000 homes, left approximately 180,000 people homeless, and wiped out approximately 80 percent of the area's farms. Until Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast in 2005, Hurricane Andrew was the costliest natural disaster in the United States' history.

We in south Florida were very fortunate to receive generous assistance from fellow Americans in the wake of Hurricane Andrew. I know that assistance was essential for recovery, as it is for recovery in the gulf coast.

As someone who experienced Hurricane Andrew firsthand, I have an idea of the trials that confront those who live through horrific storms. The road to recovery is long and difficult. It doesn't come easy. But communities must come together and put all of their efforts into rebuilding and meeting the needs of the residents. We cannot walk away from our obligations to our fellow Americans. And, just as we did after Andrew, together we must build, together we must recover, together we must be better and stronger than before.

Immediately after Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast, the Republican majority in this Congress committed over \$100 billion to help the area confront the immediate aftermath of the storm and to deal with the recovery effort. Included in that were \$16.7 billion, almost \$17 billion for the Community Development Block Grant programs. States applied for those funds through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. So far, HUD has approved under \$11 billion of those funds to affected States.

Madam Speaker, we all agree that those who wish to return to New Orleans or other devastated areas should be able to do so. This is the position of Mr. Alphonso Jackson, the Housing and Urban Development Secretary, which he reiterated in August when he said during a visit to New Orleans, "Every family who wants to come home should have the opportunity to come back." We should all do what we can to make certain that we rebuild, that we see communities rebuild and become even more robust and safer communities.

The underlying legislation seeks to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina. There is some concern, Madam Speaker, that the legislation goes beyond the scope of the bill's stated intent. For example,

the legislation seeks to turn what is currently a temporary disaster voucher program into a permanent voucher, and to require HUD to provide tenant replacement vouchers for all public housing units not brought back on line, including those slated for demolition prior to the storms.

The American people have demonstrated their resiliency before and will do so again. Obviously our prayers continue to go out to the victims and their families of these horrific natural disasters. The spirit of community, generosity, and goodwill across the country continues to give me confidence that Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, just as Florida did before, will recover from these tragedies stronger and better than before.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee. He listened to the needs of Miami-Dade County with regard to how the distribution formula for HUD section 8, when it was changed in the CR that this Congress passed some weeks back. There was damage, damage cost, and the chairman is ameliorating and alleviating that damage, and we are grateful for that.

Now, Mrs. BIGGERT, our colleague from Illinois, went before the Rules Committee with an amendment to hold harmless all of the public housing agents from the damage done by the change in the formula in the CR, to hold harmless all the agencies through this calendar year. I am sorry, I truly am, that the majority in the Rules Committee refused to make in order Mrs. BIGGERT's amendment, and that is one of the reasons why we are opposing the rule today.

I think it is appropriate to point out that the majority is failing to live up to its commitment to run the House in an open and fair manner. The majority sent a notice to Members that they had until Monday at 10 a.m. to file amendments with the Rules Committee in order to be considered; however, the official committee report accompanying this bill was not filed until Friday, giving Members less than 1 business day to review the report and file amendments for consideration, not to mention the fact that most Members were already in their districts or traveling back home on Friday.

So I think it is fair to ask the question, how can the majority expect Members to review the actions of the Committee on Financial Services in a timely manner when they barely give them a chance to review the committee report?

The majority also promised to provide more open rules. Yes, they have provided several open rules on non-controversial bills. I think it is important to ask, what about on bills where both sides do not necessarily agree on all aspects of the legislation? Will the majority continue to block amendments from the minority? What will they do on the supplemental appropriations bill? We shall soon find out.

I believe it is fair to say, if the majority is serious about their commitment to openness, they should allow for open rules on the underlying legislation and the supplemental appropriations bill which is coming forth soon. Members of the minority are concerned that this bill, as I stated before, turns a temporary disaster voucher program into a permanent one, and the concern that of the \$110 billion appropriated by the 109th Congress, only a small portion has been distributed to those in need. In response to these concerns, they offered several thoughtful and germane amendments to the Rules Committee to address their concerns; however, the majority once again closed them out. I think that is unfortunate, and, again, that is why, Madam Speaker, we oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, just in response to the comments by my friend from Florida, this pretty much is an open rule. The ones that weren't allowed were nongermane. And then there was one amendment that was not allowed because it was an amendment that was earlier offered and rejected by this House, and that was at the recommendation of the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, who had a very open process in the Financial Services Committee considering numerous amendments and then has pretty much invited any Member who wanted to submit an amendment to have an opportunity on the floor to do so or for consideration before the Rules Committee.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chair of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, no, it is not a fully open rule. It is a far more open rule than any that the majority allowed in the previous Congress on major legislation from the Financial Services Committee. I tell you that as a fact.

First, the argument was made that people didn't have enough time to file amendments. This bill was voted out of committee on March 7. It is true that the actual report was delayed. It was delayed partly because staff on both sides held up the actual writing on the language, and we had a CBO scoring issue, and we were waiting for CBO. But the text of the bill was put forward publicly on March 7.

In fact, there are a number of amendments offered here; most of them are from members of the committee, some are from nonmembers of the committee.

So the notion that people didn't know until Friday what to put in the amendments on Monday is false. The fact is that this bill on March 7 was voted out of committee. In fact, the text of the bill was set on March 6.

What we did on March 7 was come back and complete roll call. But as of noon on March 7, people knew what would be in this bill. It was not a secret that we were marking it up; it was not a secret that it would be coming up today.

So anybody who waited until Friday, who made the mistake, they have themselves to blame. In fact, we made a couple of accommodations. The gentleman from Georgia had an amendment which he filed which was misfiled, and his amendment as filed went to a section different than he wanted to affect.

□ 1315

Whether you realize that, we urged the Rules committee to allow him, after the deadline, to make an appropriate substitution. That was done so that his appropriate amendment is in order. To the extent that there was that technical glitch, we said, that's not right; let's allow the gentleman from Georgia's amendment to go forward, the one substantive to the bill.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) had an important amendment that was adopted in committee. CBO raised issues with it. We then asked the Rules Committee, after the deadline, to accommodate a change for Mr. BAKER's amendment because we were accommodating the CBO scoring. So we did make two agreements after the deadline to accommodate these particular changes.

But I want to stress again, Members knew on March 7 what was going to be in this bill. So I don't know why anybody would have waited until Friday to do the amendments. It was a fairly public controversial process that we had. We had a number of rollcalls in the committee.

And I will say this: my view, I would have had a rule that was even more accommodating. But what this does is allow every amendment that the Parliamentarian's Office found to be germane to the bill and the substance of this program to be in order. There is some debate over one amendment from the gentleman from Georgia involving a kind of generic language about offsets. And that was not allowed. I would have voted to allow it; but it was not allowed. We considered it in committee. It was voted on, debated, defeated.

But every amendment that was offered and, again, the deadline for amendments was Monday. The bill had been voted out of committee on Wednesday, March 7. There was plenty of time for that bill to be looked at and for people to offer amendments. When I saw the amendments on Monday, I urged the Rules Committee to put in order everything that was germane. They have put in order a number of germane amendments with a lot of debate time.

Now, I understand that there are Members who would like it to have included a few more things. But every single one of them voted for rules far

more restrictive. So this bill, you know, I have always thought the question is, Is this a good rule? I have always thought the fount of all wisdom that we should be guided by was expounded by a philosopher named Henny Youngman, whom you, Madam Speaker, along with I certainly remember. And the wisdom was, asked, How is your wife, the answer was, Compared to what? And is this a good rule? Compared to what? Compared to every rule that affected the Committee on Financial Services during Republican leadership, it is a rule of great openness. Compared to an ideal of complete openness, not quite.

So it is a far better rule than any Republicans ever brought forward with regard to openness. It is not as good as I would like, but it does allow into debate every amendment germane to the substance of this bill, particularly to this bill, in terms of these programs, a number of amendments that change it one way or the other: some that would expand it, some that would retract it. And I believe the House will have a chance to work its will on this issue.

The only other thing I would say is this when we are talking about time: For people who haven't been remembering exactly, I do want to remind people, despite what you might think, it is not November of 2005. We are now here in March of 2007. I say that because people who saw the devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in Mississippi and in Louisiana, to some extent in Texas, and who expected the Federal Government to respond, and looked at the things we are doing, which are called for by that dilemma that was created by the hurricanes, they would have assumed that their Federal Government would have done that within a couple of months after the hurricanes.

Unfortunately, about an 18-month freeze elapsed because the now-minority, then-majority, did not have the energy to deal with it. So we are doing a bill today that is 18 months overdue.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you for allowing or supporting the inclusion of one of my amendments. But you would agree, I hope, that the reason that the section was misidentified in the initial submission to the Rules Committee is because the text of the bill that we are considering today wasn't available until Friday afternoon, and that section numbers indeed changed; is that not correct?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, I do agree, but it was changed as of Friday, and so people could have looked at that on Friday and gotten it right. And I appreciate that. So, yeah, the section changed and as somebody even picked it up as of Friday, in the case of the gentleman from Louisiana, it was a different thing. We didn't get the CBO's

scoring until too late, and then we had to work it out. The scoring came in. Part of the problem was CBO is very busy, and we passed the bill on March 7 and we didn't get their scoring until that Friday, and that was one of the reasons for the delay.

I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that there are 12½ minutes remaining for the gentleman from Vermont and 21 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before yielding to my good friend from Georgia.

I think a fundamental part of the role of the opposition of the minority is to hold the majority accountable, not only to history, which our friend from Massachusetts is making reference to, but accountable with regard to the promises made by the majority.

And so it was the majority that reiterated that they would bring an open process. And, for example, we are already seeing not only, we have seen in bill after bill after bill, the minority closed out. But also, for example, rules passed by the majority, for example, requiring 3 days for people to view legislation before it comes to the floor, rules like that being waived.

So let's see, for example, what is done on the supplemental appropriations bill. Are they going to waive the rule passed by the majority requiring 3 days? Are they going to waive it with regard to that legislation as well?

And my friends on the other side of the aisle point out that, I think they said this is almost an open rule. It is not an open rule.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I mentioned before, had an amendment to hold harmless the public housing agencies from the effects of the change in the formula in the middle of the fiscal year with regard to section 8. And her amendment was not made in order.

So it is important to point that out. No, this is not an open rule nor an almost open rule nor a semi- or a pseudo-open rule. It is not an open rule.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, first, the Parliamentarian ruled that the gentlewoman from Illinois' amendment which we debated in committee was not germane because it went far beyond the hurricane. So that was the reason for that.

The second thing is I want to concede one point to the gentleman. He has chided us because we have set ourselves too low a standard. We have set ourselves the standard of simply being better than they were last year. I acknowledge that is too low a bar. I think we have met it with ease, but I

am inclined to do better. So I promise him, as far as I am concerned, I will try to have a higher standard.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I don't know exactly where the standard is in height. I will say that the promise was an open process, and that process does not exist, and that promise has not been kept. And in bill after bill after bill, the minority is closed out.

Now, it is true that some open rules have been permitted on legislation that we would bring forth under suspension. Madam Speaker, when bills are non-controversial, many times they are brought forth under a process called suspension of the rules when there is mostly unanimity or often unanimity or almost unanimity in this House. Yes. So in bills like that we have seen some open rules where the minority has been able to have the amendments that it wishes to be considered.

But I just want to remind colleagues that may be listening to this debate, Madam Speaker, that when I point to Mrs. BIGGERT, it is not a theoretical, you know, height issue, whether so much height of a promise has been met. No. No. Mrs. BIGGERT is here and Mrs. BIGGERT is a colleague, and she went before the Rules Committee with an amendment that I thought was an important amendment and that she has worked hard on, and she was closed out.

As a matter of fact, I would like to recognize, at this point, another colleague, and then I will recognize Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, Dr. PRICE, who also had an amendment, a germane amendment, that he has worked on, that he has given thought and effort to and he brought to the Rules Committee so that we here could consider it today. And he was closed out.

So, again, not theory, not height, not almost closed, almost open. The gentleman from Georgia exists.

I yield 4 minutes to Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for his passion for openness and honesty in our process, and I thank him for yielding me some time.

I rise to oppose this rule for two specific reasons. One is because it is not an open rule. It is not an open rule. It is a violation of the assurances that we have been provided by the majority party. It is not an open rule. Having a little bit of an open rule is like being a little bit pregnant. It ain't possible. This is not an open rule. And I stand here with an amendment that was turned down by the Rules Committee. I stand here also opposing this because this rule takes fiscal sanity and it moves it into a room somewhere, a very dark room, and then locks the door and it throws away the key.

I have in my hand, Madam Speaker, the report from the Rules Committee on what we are considering today. And it has the amendment that I had offered, commonly known as PAYGO,

and it has the recorded vote. This is in the Rules Committee yesterday.

And my amendment would have been very simple. It said: "Would require any new spending authorized by this legislation to have a specific offset." Simple. And what happened on the vote? Mr. MCGOVERN voted "no." Mr. HASTINGS from Florida voted "no." Mr. WELCH voted "no." Mr. ARCURI voted "no." Ms. SLAUGHTER voted "no." Ms. MATSUI voted "no." They voted against even considering, even considering financial responsibility. So I rise to oppose this rule.

This new majority has promised a fair and open process; but, Madam Speaker, I am here to tell you that what we are living in now is the land of Orwellian democracy. Because they just say something, they think it is so. Once again, this majority has blocked a vote on applying pay-as-you-go principles to new spending.

We have wonderful comments from leadership on the other side. Speaker PELOSI has said, on a previous rule, when the Republicans were in charge, "Because the debate has been limited and Americans' voices silenced by this restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule." And I support that sentiment. "Because this is a restrictive rule, I urge my colleagues to vote 'no.'"

Majority Leader STENY HOYER said on a rule that came before the House, "Mr. Speaker, once again this House majority is resorting to heavy-handed tactics that are designed to do one thing only, to achieve a pre-ordained result by shutting down a full and fair debate in this House." And that is precisely what the majority party is doing now.

The new Chair of the Rules Committee said, "If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills. An open process should be the norm, not the exception."

Democrat Caucus Chair RAHM EMANUEL said, "Let us have an up or down vote. Don't be scared. Don't hide behind some little rule. Come on out here. Put it on the table. Let us have a vote."

So I ask my friends on the majority side, what are you afraid of? The amendment said: "Which would require any new spending authorized by this legislation to have a specific offset."

What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of? That is real financial responsibility.

My good friend from Massachusetts said that they were waiting on a CBO scoring. Well, then the bill does require funding. In fact, what the CBO has said, that it has a price tag of nearly \$1.3 billion. Maybe money well spent, but I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that it is money that we ought to find in our current budget.

So this hypocrisy of the majority party is stifling, absolutely stifling.

They are not the most open and fair Congress in history; in fact, they are a far cry from it.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule based on fiscal responsibility and based on the hypocrisy of the majority party claiming to provide open rules, claiming to provide real and honest debate and running away from it once again.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, in response to my friend from Georgia, I would say two things. First, there are seven amendments that have been allowed. One of them included an amendment by the gentleman from Georgia that was not timely, but was accommodated by the Rules Committee. The amendment that was rejected is an amendment that has been rejected before.

The second point that I think it is important to make is that we have a responsibility in this House to get work done.

□ 1330

And the rules are intended to help us do the work of the American people, not be a political wedge to make bogus arguments about process. And it is a disgrace, it is a disgrace, that going on 2 years after these hurricanes, there are people who are still homeless because we had a Federal Emergency Management Administration that was incompetent and reckless. It was headed by a person whose previous experience was as a judge of an Arabian horse contest, and that happened under the administration and the Congress that was led by Republicans.

That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to this Congress. It is not acceptable to this party. It is not acceptable to this Congressman. It is not acceptable by a bipartisan vote of 52-16 of the Financial Services Committee.

We have business to do because there are people who are still in emergency situations well over a year after devastating hurricanes. This legislation is about doing something now that should have been done 1½ years ago.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman Mr. WELCH for his insightful leadership on this issue, and I thank the Financial Services Committee.

And I ask the question of my colleagues, how many of them have encountered Hurricane Katrina survivors, as I have every day in my congressional district, or been back to the scene of the crime, if you will, along the Mississippi gulf or the Louisiana gulf and asked the question, how long?

This legislation, which I believe the Rules Committee has been enormously fair in allowing amendments by both Republicans and Democrats, answers the immediacy of the concerns. One, being no housing. One of the amendments Mr. GREEN will be offering is raising the question of extending the

benefits so that individuals who are trying to recoup themselves to get back home will have housing. How many have walked into apartments in Houston, Texas, and talked to Katrina survivors who held in their hand an eviction notice because their FEMA benefits were being cut off, while at the same time they were trying to access the Road Home Program, and they could not access those dollars?

So this is answering real questions for real Americans, and it answers the failures of this administration, which never seemed to get it together and concern themselves enough with breaking, if you will, the entanglement of bureaucracy to ensure that these individuals will receive benefits.

So one of the issues, Madam Speaker, as we both serve on the Homeland Security Committee, is to pre-prepare so we are in front of the natural disaster or man-made disaster. I look forward to legislation that establishes post disaster housing, not trailers, so that individuals can be evacuated to real housing that is there in place to be able to be of help.

This legislation moves the ball further down the road. It is long overdue. It is a good rule. It is a rule that I have not seen in my time here in the Congress under the other majority; so I am grateful that we are moving forward as we are.

Let us vote for the rule. Let us vote for the underlying legislation. Let us help those who need our help, and let us help them now.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished friend from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), who also had an amendment that was closed out, closed out by the majority in the Rules Committee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, while I am grateful that this rule made in order one of my amendments to H.R. 1227, I rise today in opposition to this modified closed rule because my other amendment, a very important amendment, was not made in order.

My second amendment would have struck section 302 of H.R. 1227 and inserted a new section at the end of the bill resetting the section 8 funding formula to its pre-continuing resolution state. The amendment would require HUD to distribute section 8 funds to public housing authorities for the remainder of the 2007 calendar year as they were distributed before the enactment of the continuing resolution just last month.

The section 8 funding formula change that was included in the CR was not well thought out. One doesn't need to look very far for evidence of this fact. Under the funding formula change that was included in the CR, all of the gulf coast PHAs lose funding, and the budget of the New Orleans PHA alone drops from \$73 million to \$3 million in 2007 and then permanently from there on.

The bill before us today fixes this problem for the gulf coast and New Orleans PHAs, but not for the rest of the country. I guess they realized that they had made a mistake in that area, but let's just leave the other PHAs in trouble. Half of the PHAs in the country, then, over 1,200 public housing authorities in 29 States, remain in trouble.

Because of the section 8 funding formula change in the CR, PHAs in half of our Nation's communities will not be able to serve many of our neediest citizens. Very soon HUD will issue a notice that informs PHAs that if they haven't spent their "unspent balances" by a date certain, they lose these funds. If a person is walking the streets with a voucher and hasn't found a place to rent, he or she loses the voucher because these "unspent funds" will be recaptured by HUD. It was wrong to change the funding formula midyear when PHAs had already set their budgets for this year.

My amendment would have corrected this problem by telling HUD to distribute section 8 funds to PHAs for the remainder of 2007 calendar year as they were distributed to PHAs before the enactment of the CR.

Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues on the Rules Committee voted against making my amendment in order and against restoring much-needed funds to many of the Nation's PHAs. And they did so with full knowledge that PHAs in their own congressional districts would benefit from my amendment.

All three counties in my district lose funding under the formula change in this CR, but at least I attempted to do something about it and didn't consciously vote against fixing the problem.

We also will continue to try to fix the problem caused by the section 8 formula included in the CR. As ranking member on the Housing Subcommittee, I will continue to work with my Housing colleague Chairwoman Maxine Waters to craft a bipartisan section 8 reform bill in the Financial Services Committee, which is the appropriate place to address any changes to the funding formula, not in an appropriation bill such as the recently enacted CR.

I recognize that the minority party may not be able to stop this rule from going forward, Madam Speaker, but I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to seriously consider voting against this rule. While the bill prevents PHAs in the Gulf Stream from being harmed by the formula in the CR, this rule does nothing to help PHAs nationwide that are in the same predicament.

Again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I rise to correct myself.

The gentleman from Georgia asked me to acknowledge that his amendment was originally misfiled because of a change in the section that occurred last Friday. I acknowledged that, but incorrectly. In fact, the change happened during the markup. The section was renumbered during the markup. And the gentleman, of course, being a member of the committee, could have done that.

I want to stress again no change was made in the text of that bill from March 7 until today; so anybody who wanted to offer amendments knew that on March 7.

Secondly, as to the gentlewoman from Illinois, as I said, I guess I am coming here, Madam Speaker, confessing all day. I mean, I confess that I have not reached as high enough a standard as I should in parliamentary terms because I have taken simply being better than the Republicans as my standard, and I pledge to do better.

Similarly, I guess I should be scolded for being lax on the rules. The gentlewoman from Illinois offered her amendment in committee. We did not raise a point of order against it in committee. Now, I do want to point out the parliamentarian for our committee is the parliamentarian that was the parliamentarian under my predecessor. That is one of the first things I did after the election was to call the parliamentarian, Mr. Duncan, a former member of the Parliamentarian's Office, who had been hired by my predecessor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Oxley), and asked him to stay on. I believe it should be totally nonpartisan, and I believe it has been. It was the Parliamentarian's Office that told the Rules Committee that the gentlewoman from Illinois' amendment was not germane.

Now, I acknowledge my excessive tolerance. I have learned I am more tolerant of a lot of things than a lot of people here, and I accept that. I perhaps should have been more strict with regard to the committee. We had that debated, and the rule is generally that you do not take something that is narrowly applied and make it broader. There is language in this bill that applies to how vouchers are allocated where there was a hurricane. The gentlewoman wanted to change something that had been in the CR. She said it shouldn't have been in the CR. And I will say this: We will in our committee be revisiting that. We will have a voucher bill. That will come before our committee going forward. But I do want to make it clear in defense of the Rules Committee that where I allowed the amendment without getting a ruling on it, the Rules Committee, when they restricted the gentlewoman's amendment from being offered, were following the ruling of the parliamentarian that it was not germane.

I will yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When it was in committee, there was no point of order. And the amendment

also contained New Orleans and the gulf coast.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I understand.

Mrs. BIGGERT. That was carved out by your side of the aisle, realizing that that was very important, leaving the other PHAs.

When I went to the Rules Committee, I spent over an hour there, and the germaneness never came up.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I acknowledge that I did not raise a point of order. I acknowledge that I was very tolerant and did not make a point of order that apparently would have been sustained by the parliamentarian. But it was the parliamentarian who said that.

I am sorry the woman spent over an hour in the Rules Committee. Sometimes that is fun; sometimes it is not, but that is part of the job. But the fact is that the decision to exclude her particular amendment was made on the ruling of the parliamentarian that it was not germane.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are grateful for the tolerance in the gentleman's committee with regard to the amendment presented by Mrs. BIGGERT. The Rules Committee could have been equally tolerant. Let us be clear.

In other words, the Rules Committee waives points of order, Madam Speaker, with regard to the whole bill; so, obviously, they could have waived a point of order with regard to the issue of germaneness for Mrs. BIGGERT. So the Rules Committee could have been amply tolerant. And that is one of the reasons, since the Rules Committee majority was not, with regard to our colleague who has put so much work into this issue to hold harmless the public housing agencies for the remainder of this year from the mistake made by the majority in the so-called continuing resolution, that we believe that she should have been able to make her point before all of the Members.

Madam Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I have come down here this morning not to really speak about the process. It is to discuss with all my fellow Members something that I think we need to make a commitment to going forward.

Hurricane Katrina was a terrible tragedy for the gulf coast. It was a terrible tragedy for New Orleans. In fact, it was the greatest tragedy that we have had as far as a natural disaster in the history of our country. As far as loss of property and loss of life, it is somewhere between five and six times greater than anything we had ever experienced before. When you talk property loss, uninsured property loss, because a lot of the flooding was in New Orleans where there was not flood insurance, or along the coast where they

had wind insurance but not for the surge, the storm surge, the losses are even greater.

But out of a tragedy, there ought to always be opportunities. And the opportunity that we have let slip by today, and, as I said, I am more concerned about the future, and I hope that the chairman of the full committee will work with me, is for us to go back and make sure that we do right by the people of New Orleans in public housing.

□ 1345

The New Orleans public housing was a failure. It was dysfunctional, and it had been so for 40 or 50 years.

There is a philanthropist in Atlanta who has helped build a community in Atlanta called East Lake. It was the highest crime area in the State of Georgia. Today it is one of the safest precincts in the State of Georgia. He did it not by replacing one-on-one public housing units, as we are going to do in this bill. He did it by making a mixed community of renters, subsidized renters, owners and public housing units.

In the State of New York, almost half of the prisoners in the State penitentiary in New York State come from public housing projects in seven ZIP codes in New York.

We owe it to our citizens all over the United States, not just in New Orleans, to try to make a model, a vision in New Orleans, and correct what is a community of public housing where children actually hide in bathtubs and sleep in bathtubs at night because that is the only safe place to be. That ought not to be in America.

We can change this. We know how to do it. Some of these HOPE VI projects are amazing. We didn't do this in this bill. We owe it to the American people to do it going forward.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and all who have participated in this debate for having done so. I think it has been a good debate.

I simply want to reiterate that on such an important issue, I am sorry that we do not have a truly open rule, one that obviously would satisfy any definition of the word. Under an open rule, for example, Mrs. BIGGERT could have had her hold-harmless amendment discussed and debated by the full House, as well as Dr. PRICE and others who wanted to have their amendments debated and discussed.

I would simply urge and request of my friends on the other side of the aisle that not only on noncontroversial bills should we have the ability for the minority to be heard, not only on noncontroversial bills or bills of consensus should there be open rules, but rather there should be open rules on other legislation, legislation where there will be

genuine debate and even disagreement and discussion.

Madam Speaker, having said that, having no other speakers, and reiterating our opposition to the rule, and looking forward to the debate on the underlying legislation, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my good friend from Florida.

Once again, Madam Speaker, this is, we believe, a fair and open rule that provides consideration for a much-needed, bipartisan piece of legislation. The rule makes in order nearly every amendment brought to the Rules Committee, more Republican than Democratic amendments, and with considerable time to debate the merits of each amendment that will be presented.

The underlying bill will provide increased flexibility for already allocated funds, provide new oversight for existing programs. It preserves public housing, assists evacuees with rental housing and provides support for landlords in local communities who assisted evacuees with housing.

Don't forget the displaced victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma. That is really what this is all about. The Federal Government's response to the storms has been a national embarrassment, and it is just not acceptable. We have an obligation, all of us, to get our act together so that they can move on with their lives and put them back together.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 254 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 42; suspending the rules and passing H.R. 759; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra

Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Braley (IA)

Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver

Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebuck  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy

Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor

Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry

Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallely  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Keller



King (IA)	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
King (NY)	Musgrave	Shadegg
Kingston	Myrick	Shays
Kirk	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Shuster
Knollenberg	Pearce	Simpson
Kuhl (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (NE)
LaHood	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pitts	Souder
LaTourette	Platts	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Poe	Sullivan
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Tancred
Linder	Price (GA)	Terry
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Lucas	Putnam	Tiahrt
Lungren, Daniel E.	Radanovich	Tiberi
	Ramstad	Turner
Mack	Regula	Upton
Manzullo	Rehberg	Walberg
Marchant	Reichert	Walden (OR)
McCarthy (CA)	Renzi	Walsh (NY)
McCaul (TX)	Reynolds	Wamp
McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (FL)
McCrery	Rogers (KY)	Weller
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Wicker
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
McMorris	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Royce	Wolf
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Sali	Young (FL)
Miller (MI)	Saxton	
Miller, Gary	Schmidt	

## NOT VOTING—15

Bachus	Gilchrest	Meehan
Brady (PA)	Graves	Paul
Cannon	Kanjorski	Pence
Castor	Kucinich	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Larsen (WA)	Westmoreland

□ 1415

Messrs. TERRY, SULLIVAN, JORDAN of Ohio and TOM DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE JACK METCALF

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues that last Thursday, one of our former colleagues, Jack Metcalf, who represented the Second District in Washington State, passed away.

So, Madam Speaker, I would ask if we could have a moment of silence in his remembrance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

## HONORING HEROIC SERVICE OF GLIDER PILOTS OF UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 42, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 42, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

## YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Cole (OK)	Granger
Ackerman	Conaway	Green, Al
Aderholt	Conyers	Green, Gene
Akin	Cooper	Grijalva
Alexander	Costa	Gutierrez
Allen	Costello	Hall (NY)
Altmire	Courtney	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Cramer	Hare
Arcuri	Crenshaw	Harman
Baca	Crowley	Hastert
Bachmann	Cubin	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Culberson	Hayes
Baker	Cummings	Heller
Baldwin	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Barrett (SC)	Davis (CA)	Herger
Barrow	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Barton (TX)	Davis, David	Hill
Bean	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchey
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Berkley	Deal (GA)	Hirono
Berman	DeFazio	Hobson
Berry	DeGette	Hodes
Biggert	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Bilbray	DeLauro	Holden
Bilirakis	Dent	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooey
Bishop (UT)	Dicks	Hoyer
Blackburn	Dingell	Hulshof
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hunter
Blunt	Donnelly	Inglis (SC)
Boehner	Doolittle	Inslee
Bonner	Doyle	Israel
Bono	Drake	Issa
Boozman	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boren	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	Edwards	(TX)
Boucher	Ehlers	Jefferson
Boustany	Ellison	Jindal
Boyd (FL)	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Boyd (KS)	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Brown (SC)	English (PA)	Jones (NC)
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Jordan
Ginny	Everett	Kagen
Buchanan	Fallin	Kaptur
Burgess	Farr	Keller
Burton (IN)	Fattah	Kennedy
Butterfield	Feeney	Kildee
Buyer	Ferguson	Kilpatrick
Calvert	Filner	Kind
Camp (MI)	Flake	King (IA)
Campbell (CA)	Forbes	King (NY)
Cantor	Fortenberry	Kingston
Capito	Fossella	Kirk
Capps	Fox	Klein (FL)
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Kline (MN)
Cardoza	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Kuhl (NY)
Carney	Gallegly	LaHood
Carson	Garrett (NJ)	Lamborn
Carter	Gerlach	Lampson
Castle	Giffords	Langevin
Chabot	Gillibrand	Lantos
Chandler	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Clarke	Gingrey	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gohmert	Latham
Cleaver	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Clyburn	Goode	Lee
Coble	Goodlatte	Levin
Cohen	Gordon	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)	Olver	Shuster
Lewis (KY)	Ortiz	Simpson
Linder	Pallone	Sires
Lipinski	Pascrell	Skelton
LoBiondo	Pastor	Slaughter
Loeb	Paul	Smith (NE)
Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
	Peterson (PA)	Solis
Lynch	Petri	Souder
Mack	Pickering	Space
Mahoney (FL)	Pitts	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Platts	Stark
Manzullo	Poe	Stearns
Marchant	Pomeroy	Stupak
Markey	Porter	Sullivan
Marshall	Price (GA)	Sutton
Matheson	Price (NC)	Tancred
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Taylor
McCaul (TX)	Rahall	Terry
McCollum (MN)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCrery	Regula	Thornberry
McDermott	Rehberg	Tiahrt
McGovern	Reichert	Tiberi
McHenry	Renzi	Tierney
McHugh	Reyes	Towns
McIntyre	Reynolds	Turner
McKeon	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Udall (NM)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Van Hollen
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Velázquez
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Meeks (NY)	Roskam	Walberg
Melancon	Ross	Walden (OR)
Mica	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
Millender-	Royce	Wamp
McDonald	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Miller (FL)	Rush	Schultz
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Watson
Miller, Gary	Salazar	Watt
Miller, George	Sali	Waxman
Mitchell	Sánchez, Linda T.	Weiner
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch (VT)
Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Weldon (FL)
Moore (WI)	Saxton	Weller
Moran (KS)	Schiff	Westmoreland
Moran (VA)	Schmidt	Wexler
Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Whitfield
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Murphy, Tim	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (OH)
Musgrave	Serrano	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Sestak	Wolf
Nadler	Shadegg	Woolsey
Napolitano	Shays	Wu
Neal (MA)	Shea-Porter	Wynn
Neugebauer	Sherman	Yarmuth
Nunes	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Shuler	Young (FL)
Obey		

## NOT VOTING—12

Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Meehan
Cannon	Graves	Pence
Castor	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Sessions

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1426

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution honoring the heroic service and sacrifice of the glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## BOB HOPE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 759, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 759.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Conaway	Green, Al
Ackerman	Conyers	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Cooper	Grijalva
Akin	Costa	Gutierrez
Alexander	Costello	Hall (NY)
Allen	Courtney	Hall (TX)
Altmire	Cramer	Hare
Andrews	Crenshaw	Harman
Arcuri	Crowley	Hastert
Baca	Cubin	Hastings (FL)
Bachmann	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Culberson	Hayes
Baird	Cummings	Heller
Baker	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Herger
Barrett (SC)	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Barrow	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, David	Hill
Barton (TX)	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchey
Bean	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Becerra	Deal (GA)	Hirono
Berkley	DeFazio	Hobson
Berman	DeGette	Hodes
Berry	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Biggert	DeLauro	Holden
Bilbray	Dent	Holt
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Hoyer
Bishop (UT)	Dingell	Hulshof
Blackburn	Doggett	Hunter
Blumenauer	Donnelly	Inglis (SC)
Blunt	Doolittle	Inslee
Boehner	Doyle	Israel
Bonner	Drake	Issa
Bono	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boozman	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Boren	Edwards	(TX)
Boswell	Ehlers	Jefferson
Boucher	Ellison	Jindal
Boustany	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Boyd (KS)	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (TX)	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Braley (IA)	English (PA)	Jones (NC)
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Jordan
Brown-Waite,	Everett	Kagen
Ginny	Fallin	Kaptur
Buchanan	Farr	Keller
Burgess	Fattah	Kennedy
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Kildee
Butterfield	Ferguson	Kilpatrick
Buyer	Filner	Kind
Calvert	Flake	King (IA)
Camp (MI)	Forbes	King (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Fortenberry	Kingston
Cantor	Fossella	Kirk
Capito	Fox	Klein (FL)
Capps	Frank (MA)	Kline (MN)
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Kuhl (NY)
Carnahan	Gallegly	LaHood
Carney	Garrett (NJ)	Lamborn
Carson	Gerlach	Lampson
Carter	Giffords	Langevin
Castle	Gillibrand	Lantos
Chabot	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Chandler	Gingrey	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gohmert	Latham
Cleaver	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Clyburn	Goode	Lee
Coble	Goodlatte	Levin
Cohen	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Cole (OK)	Granger	Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)	Ortiz	Simpson
Linder	Pallone	Sires
Lipinski	Pascrell	Skelton
LoBiondo	Pastor	Slaughter
Loeb sack	Paul	Smith (NE)
Lofgren, Zoe	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
E.	Peterson (PA)	Solis
Lynch	Petri	Souder
Mack	Pickering	Space
Mahoney (FL)	Pitts	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Platts	Stark
Manzullo	Poe	Stearns
Marchant	Pomeroy	Stupak
Markey	Porter	Sullivan
Marshall	Price (GA)	Sutton
Matheson	Price (NC)	Tancredo
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Taylor
McCaul (TX)	Rahall	Terry
McCollum (MN)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCrery	Regula	Thornberry
McDermott	Rehberg	Tiahrt
McGovern	Reichert	Tiberi
McHenry	Renzi	Tierney
McHugh	Reyes	Towns
McIntyre	Reynolds	Turner
McKeon	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Udall (NM)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Van Hollen
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Velázquez
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Meeks (NY)	Roskam	Walberg
Melancon	Ross	Walden (OR)
Mica	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
Millender-	Royce	Wamp
McDonald	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Miller (FL)	Rush	Schultz
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Watson
Miller, Gary	Salazar	Watt
Miller, George	Sali	Waxman
Mitchell	Sánchez, Linda	Weiner
Mollohan	T.	Welch (VT)
Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Weldon (FL)
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Weller
Moran (KS)	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Moran (VA)	Schiff	Wexler
Murphy (CT)	Schmidt	Whitfield
Murphy, Patrick	Schwartz	Wicker
Murphy, Tim	Scott (GA)	Wilson (NM)
Murtha	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Musgrave	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Myrick	Serrano	Wolf
Nadler	Sestak	Woolsey
Napolitano	Shadegg	Wu
Neal (MA)	Shays	Wynn
Neugebauer	Shea-Porter	Yarmuth
Nunes	Sherman	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Obey	Shuler	
Oliver	Shuster	

NAYS—1

Clarke

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (PA)  
Cannon  
Castor  
Davis, Jo Ann

Gilchrest  
Graves  
Kanjorski  
Kucinich

Meehan  
Pence  
Saxton  
Sessions

□ 1436

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 149, answered “present” 2, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—265

Abercrombie	Gerlach	Miller (NC)
Ackerman	Gillmor	Miller, George
Aderholt	Gonzalez	Mitchell
Alexander	Goodlatte	Mollohan
Allen	Gordon	Moore (KS)
Andrews	Granger	Moore (WI)
Arcuri	Green, Al	Moran (VA)
Baca	Green, Gene	Murphy (CT)
Baker	Grijalva	Murphy, Patrick
Bean	Gutierrez	Murphy, Tim
Becerra	Hall (NY)	Murtha
Berkley	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Berman	Hare	Nadler
Berry	Harman	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Oberstar
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Obey
Blumenauer	Heller	Oliver
Bono	Herseth	Ortiz
Boren	Higgins	Pallone
Boswell	Hill	Pascrell
Boucher	Hinchey	Pastor
Boyd (FL)	Hinojosa	Paul
Boyda (KS)	Hirono	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hodes	Petri
Brown (SC)	Holden	Pomeroy
Brown, Corrine	Holt	Price (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Honda	Rahall
Ginny	Hooley	Rangel
Buchanan	Hoyer	Reichert
Butterfield	Hunter	Renzi
Capps	Inslee	Reyes
Capuano	Israel	Reynolds
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Carnahan	Jackson-Lee	Ross
Carney	(TX)	Rothman
Carson	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Carter	Jindal	Ruppersberger
Castle	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Salazar
Clay	Jones (NC)	Sali
Cleaver	Jones (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kagen	T.
Coble	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Keller	Sarbanes
Cole (OK)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kildee	Schiff
Cooper	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Costa	Kind	Scott (GA)
Costello	Kirk	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Cramer	Lampson	Sestak
Crowley	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lantos	Sherman
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Shimkus
Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Shuler
Davis (CA)	Lee	Simpson
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sires
Davis (KY)	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Davis, Lincoln	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis, Tom	Loeb sack	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lowey	Snyder
Delahunt	Lynch	Solis
DeLauro	Mack	Souder
Dent	Mahoney (FL)	Space
Dingell	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Doggett	Markey	Stark
Donnelly	Marshall	Sutton
Doolittle	Matsui	Tanner
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Taylor
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	McDermott	Thornberry
Ellsworth	McGovern	Tierney
Emanuel	McIntyre	Towns
Emerson	McMorris	Turner
Engel	Rodgers	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McNerney	Velázquez
Etheridge	McNulty	Visclosky
Farr	Meek (FL)	Walden (OR)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Walz (MN)
Ferguson	Melancon	Wasserman
Filner	Michaud	Schultz
Fortenberry	Millender-	Waters
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Watson

Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)

Wexler  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wynn

Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

## NAYS—149

Akin	Gillibrand	Pickering
Altire	Gingrey	Pitts
Bachmann	Goode	Platts
Bachus	Hastert	Poe
Baird	Hensarling	Porter
Barrett (SC)	Herger	Price (GA)
Barrow	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett (MD)	Hoekstra	Putnam
Barton (TX)	Hulshof	Radanovich
Biggert	Inglis (SC)	Ramstad
Billray	Issa	Regula
Bilirakis	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Blackburn	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Blunt	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Bonner	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Boozman	Kline (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Boustany	Knollenberg	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Burgess	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Lamborn	Saxton
Buyer	Larsen (WA)	Schmidt
Calvert	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Camp (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Cantor	Linder	Shuster
Capito	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Cubin	E.	Stupak
Culberson	Manzullo	Sullivan
Davis, David	Marchant	Terry
Deal (GA)	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Tiberi
Dreier	McCrery	Udall (CO)
Duncan	McHenry	Udall (NM)
Ehlers	McHugh	Upton
English (PA)	McKeon	Walberg
Everett	Mica	Walsh (NY)
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Flake	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Weller
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Fox	Musgrave	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Pearce	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Perlmutter	Wu
Giffords	Peterson (MN)	Young (FL)

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Tancred

## NOT VOTING—17

Baldwin	Dicks	Meehan
Brady (PA)	Feeney	Pence
Cannon	Gilchrest	Peterson (PA)
Castor	Graves	Sessions
Chandler	Kanjorski	Woolsey
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	

□ 1447

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 214. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

## PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT REGARDING HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006 (Division D, Title V of Public Law 109-432), amends the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (Title II of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, Public Law 106-200) (CBERA), to make certain products from Haiti eligible for preferential tariff treatment. In accordance with section 213A of CBERA, as amended, I have determined that Haiti meets the eligibility requirements under section 213A(d)(1) of CBERA, as amended, and that Haiti is meeting the conditions regarding enforcement of circumvention under section 213A(e)(1) of CBERA, as amended.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2007.

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SWEDEN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 433(d)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden. The Supplementary Agreement was signed in Stockholm on June 22, 2004, and is intended to modify certain provisions of the original United States-Sweden Agreement, which was signed May 27, 1985, and that entered into force January 1, 1987.

The United States-Sweden Agreement, as revised by the Supplementary Agreement, remains similar in objective to the social security agreements that are also in force with Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Korea, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social secu-

rity systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefits that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The United States-Sweden Agreement, as revised by the Supplementary Agreement, contains all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4).

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the Supplementary Agreement with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the Supplementary Agreement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the Supplementary Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Supplementary Agreement and a composite text of the United States-Sweden Agreement showing the changes that will be made as a result of the Supplementary Agreement. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend to the Congress the Supplementary Agreement to the United States-Sweden Social Security Agreement and related documents.

GEROGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2007.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1227 and include therein extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 254 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1227.

□ 1450

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina, with Mr. BAIRD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I begin by yielding myself 1 minute, and then yield to the main author of this bill, the gentlewoman from California.

This is a bill which comes to this House about 18 months late. It is in response to the problems of the hurricane in the gulf. It is the result of very diligent work.

One week after the committee was organized, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is the Chair of the Housing Subcommittee, and I began to work on this. We had a very long all-day hearing in Washington.

During the February break, the gentlewoman from California took her subcommittee to Louisiana and Mississippi and had very extensive hearings. As a result of these very extensive hearings and consultations, we have brought forward a bill of which she is the primary author, which we believe does as much as can be done to respond to the needs of the people in that area that have sadly been, in some ways, neglected since the hurricane.

I am very pleased to be able to yield to the gentlewoman from California, who is the moving spirit behind this bill, as much time as she consumes as we describe our very belated, but still very necessary efforts to respond to these human needs.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BARNEY FRANK, for all of the time and attention he has placed on making this our number one priority, dealing with the aftermath of Katrina. He said to me and to all of the Members of my subcommittee, "Move as quickly as you possibly can. Get the hearings going. Let's get a bill to the floor." And because of his interest and because of his support, we are here today on the floor indeed addressing many of those issues that should have been addressed a long time ago, and I thank Mr. FRANK so very much for that.

It has been exactly 2 weeks since the Committee on Financial Services considered H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007. By a vote of 50-16, the committee passed the bill. I want to thank again Chairman FRANK for supporting the bill through markup. I want to thank the members of our committee from both sides of the aisle who voted for this bill.

There are also many Members of Congress who have expressed major concerns about the rebuilding process in the gulf region post-Katrina and support this bill.

This bill addresses many of the obstacles to the rebuilding process in the

gulf region. Prior to consideration of this bill, the Committee on Financial Services held hearings on post-Katrina housing issues, followed by 2 days of subcommittee field hearings in New Orleans, Louisiana, and Gulfport, Mississippi.

The bill before you today represents consensus on one major issue; that is, for the rebuilding process in the gulf region to ever begin, we need to address the affordable housing crisis in the gulf region by returning people to their homes. Whether it is a home in need of major repair, a public housing unit damaged by the storm, or a home totally destroyed, every person who desires to live in the gulf region must be given an opportunity to rebuild and to return home.

We learned through hours of testimony that the reasons for failure in the gulf region related to the rebuilding process were often bureaucratic, administrative, as well as a consequence of inadequate poststorm planning by the Federal Government.

The hurricanes hit the gulf region in August of 2005, leaving behind unparalleled devastation. Many have acknowledged their frustration with the speed and pace of the recovery. Others realize that the efforts of Congress to provide \$110 billion to the gulf region have not necessarily resulted in money into the right people's hands, and I could not agree more.

However, this bill does not place blame on anyone, but rather recognizes the need to bring efficiency to the process, whether through administration of the Road Home program or the Federal Public Housing program, so that persons in need are assisted with the financial resources that we approved for them months ago.

I had one goal when I introduced this bill, and that was to see the gulf region rebuilt, while addressing the affordable housing crisis in the region. The hurricanes destroyed nearly 300,000 units of housing in the gulf region, affordable rental units, homes of low- and moderate-income families, and public housing. The hurricanes did not discriminate when it came to destroying the housing stock in the gulf region. No income group was spared. Whether the family lived in public housing, high-priced homes, or affordable rental housing in the gulf region, they were all affected alike. Many of the residents of the major affected areas like New Orleans and elsewhere have not recovered from the storms, and thousands are still displaced and living in other parts of the country months after the storms rather than their formal communities. While all of these persons may not choose to return or even wish to return, we must provide those who do with an opportunity to return.

H.R. 1227 is about rebuilding communities to allow people to return to the gulf region. We should not have to rebuild communities one at a time in the gulf, and in some cases that is what it

will take. What would be worse is not rebuilding any of the communities in the gulf region, and that is the path that we are currently on. Housing is the key to everything in the gulf region. No housing means zero communities. No communities will mean that rebuilding is impossible in the gulf region.

This bill will address a number of issues. The bill resolves the HUD-FEMA dispute by allowing the Hazard Mitigation Fund to be combined with the Community Development Block Grant funds. In addition, the bill requires monthly reports by the State of Louisiana on number of households assisted through the programs funded with CDBG funds for the Road Home program.

By eliminating the prohibition against the match requirement, CDBG supplemental funds can be used in conjunction with other Federal programs, including those administered by FEMA. In addition, the bill also provides for reimbursements related to an entitlement community's use of the Community Development Block Grant funds to provide rental assistance to displaced residents.

Public housing because of the hurricanes. Many public housing residents are displaced with no reasonable housing option. Living in trailers and doubling up do not qualify as reasonable housing options. This bill would provide a means to return for the greater of 3,000 or those who respond to the survey who are former New Orleans public housing residents. It also establishes the one-for-one replacement principle by requiring a plan to be approved by HUD and the residents prior to any wholesale demolition or redevelopment efforts of public housing units.

Under the bill, HUD is required to complete a survey of displaced public housing residents to determine whether they want to return to public housing in New Orleans. In addition, the bill requires HUD to report on any proposed conversion of public housing units located in areas affected by the hurricane, as well as comply with the bill's other requirements related to public housing.

The bill addresses disaster vouchers and project-based rental assistance. It extends disaster vouchers for 3 months until January 2008. Project-based vouchers would be protected where a project was destroyed or is in need of substantial rehabilitation. The bill clarifies the voucher allocation formula by requiring HUD to make appropriate adjustments consistent with the funding year 2007 continuing resolution. In addition, the bill requires a number of proactive measures related to vouchers that will ensure that no one is left without access to housing as a result of hurricanes.

□ 1500

Further, title IV of the bill would provide for the reimbursement of landlords who suffered damages related to

commitments made by FEMA in conjunction with providing rental units to displaced residents. Without their commitment to house displaced families, what can best be described as a tragedy would have become a 21st-century horror story.

I am pleased that the Members of the House are in the position to speed up the recovery and rebuilding process in the gulf region by supporting this bill. This bill is a small investment to make sure that the \$110 billion we have spent thus far is not squandered. Unfortunately, renters and homeowners alike have suffered in the gulf region for too many months. I believe this bill will bring much needed relief to those persons who have suffered the most.

Again, I would like to thank Barney Frank, our chairman, for the tremendous work that he has done. I would like to thank all of the members of our subcommittee and of the entire committee, and I want to thank Mrs. BIGGERT, the ranking member on the opposite side of the aisle, for the cooperation. She went to New Orleans. She sat in those hearings, and she visited those public housing projects, and she has as much knowledge about this as anyone.

So I am thankful that we are at this point today, and I would ask for an "aye" vote on this legislation.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking Chairman FRANK for bringing this bill to the House floor today and for presiding over a constructive debate when the Financial Services Committee considered the legislation earlier this month.

I also want to thank Ranking Member BACHUS for his leadership on this issue and of course Chairman WATERS for all the work that she has done in the Subcommittee on Housing on this.

Let me just kind of return to where we started with the hurricane on August 29, 2005. Hurricane Katrina hits New Orleans. September 2, 2005, President Bush signs into law a \$10.5 billion supplemental appropriations measure for the affected areas. It was passed by voice vote in the House. September 9, 2005, President Bush signs into law a second installment, this time for \$51.8 billion, again passed the House. March 16, 2006, the House passes the third installment for the supplemental. May 30, 2006, HUD approves Governor of Louisiana Blanco's Road Home Program, and the Governor needed congressional approval for the \$4.2 billion. Fifteen days later, the House agrees to the conference report of voting approval. June 15, 2006, President Bush signs into law a third installment for the amount of \$19.3 billion. June 16, 2006, the Road Home Program is operational in Louisiana. March 5, 2007, the Road Home enters its ninth month of operation. 112,672 Road Home applications. How many have closed? 2,790 grants.

So we have entered a new era where it was very important for us to go down and see what was happening and to make sure that we could effectively have something happen there.

The hurricanes that struck the gulf coast in August of 2005 affected over 1 million Americans, destroying or damaging some 265,000 homes and apartments in Louisiana and Mississippi alone. Since the disaster, the Federal Government has committed more than \$110 billion to help the gulf coast, including \$16.7 billion for the CDBG program, which provides flexibility for housing and economically rebuilding the programs. Unfortunately, getting the money out the door is taking more time than it should. With respect to the CDBG funding, for example, only \$1.2 billion of the \$16.7 billion promised has been delivered.

With respect to the affordable housing stock, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita left 112,000 fewer rental units in the five-State gulf coast region than existed before the storms. As the region recovers, and as residents seek to return, there has been a spike in demand for nondamaged rental units from construction workers, displaced lower-income renters, and higher-income homeowners who are temporarily renting units in the area while their houses are repaired.

Since the disaster first struck, the Financial Services Committee has certainly played an active role passing much needed legislation last Congress that relieved regulatory burdens and shored up the government's flood insurance program. During this Congress, the full committee and the Housing Subcommittee, on which I serve, have held multiple hearings on the reconstruction and recovery area in the gulf. Indeed, over the President's Day recess, as Chairwoman WATERS mentioned, my colleague from Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and I participated in field hearings held by Chairman WATERS in New Orleans and Mississippi. There we heard from residents trying to rebuild their lives and communities in the face of considerable obstacles and often maddening bureaucratic delays.

The magnitude of the challenge facing the gulf coast residents requires us to rise above partisanship and political finger-pointing and develop sustainable solutions to the very serious problems that persist in New Orleans and other parts of the region.

While the committee Republicans share the majority's goal of providing displaced families with stability and ensuring there is access to safe, affordable housing, a number of provisions in H.R. 1227 are troubling. Accordingly, the Republicans will offer several amendments made in order by the Rules Committee that will seek to assist those in need while, at the same time, being mindful of the need for fiscal responsibility and for prioritizing among competing demands for tax dollars.

It is important that we act in a deliberative and thoughtful manner on this

important piece of legislation. Rather than seeking to simply reconstitute a public housing system that was clearly broken long before Katrina made land fall, we owe it to the residents of the gulf coast to build something better. Our focus should be on helping those families who lived in the gulf before the hurricanes and wish to return home to rebuild their lives and communities.

Hurricane Katrina not only left physical devastation in its wake; it left behind a reservoir of anger, strong emotions and painful experiences. Our challenge is to channel these experiences and emotions into an appropriate response. Thousands of affected Americans depend on us not to get angry, but to do it right. So do the families who in the future may themselves experience a Katrina-like tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first for 1 minute I would like to recognize myself to acknowledge the spirit in which this happened. I think this bill is a very good blend of partisanship and bipartisanship, and they are equally important. Partisanship, there has never been a democracy in the history of the world where you did not have political parties. People who are on trying to govern themselves cannot do that as a kind of a random mass. And there are general philosophical differences. The key is not to allow those legitimate differences of ideology and partisanship to poison the ability to work together. I think this bill shows that.

And I am very grateful to the gentlewoman from Illinois, the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Alabama. We worked together on this. There were some strong disagreements. We had a number of rollcall votes. Some of them were close; some of them weren't. We have managed to reproduce through the rule most of those, not all I acknowledge, but most of those substantive disagreements about this bill, they are in here in the rule to the extent that people wanted to redebate them. And that is important.

But I acknowledge the fact that while we had some differences, that did not prevent us from coming together on some commonality. There was never in this bill any effort to delay or divert. We managed to talk seriously. And, yes, there are differences between the parties. There is on our side, I believe, a greater willingness to provide some funding for some of these things. Those will be legitimately debated.

Mr. Chairman, let me now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), who is the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, who has been very helpful, because the lives of FEMA and HUD are deeply intertwined, and trying to legislate here requires treading this. And the gentleman from Minnesota is an example to others not to allow turf consciousness and jurisdictional hypersensitivity to get in the way of good

public policy. So I thank the gentleman. I yield him such time as he will consume.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding time rather than turf. And the gentleman is quite right. I greatly appreciate the participation that we had, the partnership between our two committees. And I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts and the Chair of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and the Republican members on our committee who have all worked together to see to it that this critical piece of legislation dealing with addressing the housing needs still outstanding, 18 months after Katrina and Rita devastated the gulf coast, to see that they can be carried through, that we can deliver the needs of the people in the entire gulf coast area.

We have worked out some concerns that we had on our side through the jurisdiction our committee has over FEMA to address the problems of people to ensure that we provide new assistance and speed up the help from the existing programs, make sure that that money flows more vigorously to the people and readily.

I have been engaged with FEMA since the mid-1980s when the then-Reagan administration proposed to revise funding under, what we now call FEMA was then Civil Defense, as to reduce to zero the Federal support for almost every disaster except a very few, and then there would be only 25 percent Federal support.

With the help of a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, a Republican, and the ranking Republican on my Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, we exposed this failing to the public. We rallied support, created the framework which is today FEMA, and that Member of Congress from Pennsylvania then introduced a bill we developed in committee. We got it enacted. And many years later, he was selected by President Bush to be the first Secretary of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge. So bipartisanship on this issue goes back very deeply to the very beginning of this issue.

And one of the things I wanted to talk about that was initiated through our committee and with the Clinton administration was the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, critical funds that help get homes and properties out of storms' way, saving properties, saving lives. Over \$7 billion has been invested under FEMA in the mitigation program to over 1,000 federally declared disasters.

An independent study of the Institute for Business and Home Safety found: "Mitigation produces significant net benefits to society as a whole, to individuals, States and communities in reduced future losses and savings to the Federal Treasury in future reduced tax revenues and hazard-related expenditures. For every dollar spent on

mitigation," the study found, "the society saves an average of \$7."

After the 1993 Mississippi River floods, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds removed homes, removed entire communities from the flood zone. After tornadoes, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds created tornado-safe rooms in what is known as "Tornado Alley." We have used those funds to great benefit.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration, early on, proposed to terminate hazard mitigation funds. We restore that authority in this and previous legislation and will do so in subsequent legislation. But this is not the last bill in the House to deal with the devastation caused by Katrina, and I hope by the end of next week we will bring the Water Resources Development Act to the House floor from our committee, some nearly \$14 billion in flood control, navigation, environmental restoration projects. Of long standing, over 6 years we have waited in our committee to bring this bill to the floor. We passed it three times. It has never gotten through the Senate; never gotten to conference over it and, again, a bipartisan bill. But it will begin reconstruction of the coastal Louisiana flood plain and of the Mississippi area flood plain. It will authorize construction of the Morganza Flood Control Project in central Louisiana to protect people from flood damage and from future hurricanes. It will close the Mississippi River gulf outlet that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) well understands caused salt water intrusion and destruction of the marsh land that was the buffering and protective entity against floods that came from Lake Borne in and overtopped St. Bernard Parish, washed homes away. We will close that off and rebuild it.

So I would cite those few things. This bill is critically important. It deals with very specific aspects. All of us have to continue working together to craft the needed protection, both by restoring wetlands and putting in place the structures of flood control and wind surge damage to the gulf area and particularly to the New Orleans area. I have been there many, many times; and I can say that it is disheartening to see how slow the progress is coming along in certain areas of that city, those that desperately need it.

This bill, and I take my hat off to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee and to the gentlewoman from California for leading the charge and making a powerful statement that we are going to address these needs, this bill will effectively do that.

□ 1515

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 8 minutes to my very distinguished and esteemed colleague, the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Hurricane Katrina was a terrible tragedy for people all along the gulf coast, for the people of New Orleans, but it was a greater tragedy for those who already were living with a sense of hopelessness and despair in the public housing projects of New Orleans. For them the tragedy did not start with Katrina. It preexisted Katrina. In those housing projects, children actually slept in bathtubs for their own protection. Elderly citizens, 10 and 15 years ago, were hiding in closets.

But out of what was this despair in the housing projects of New Orleans, and really in many housing projects throughout the United States, we can use New Orleans and other models throughout this country to do something better than we have done. We have a moral imperative to change the standard of public housing in New Orleans, and not only in New Orleans but throughout this country. We can do better than simply warehousing families in failed large housing projects in crime-ridden communities. Our vision should be vibrant mixed-use communities with good housing, safe streets, and strong schools.

Consider these facts about what happens when you concentrate and change the face and the environment of public housing: several years ago, the New York Times reported that 70 percent of the inmates in the New York prison system came from just seven ZIP codes with large concentrations of public housing. In other words, where you are born and the environment you are born into may put you, in all likelihood, on the road to the penitentiary. When you live in a neighborhood where poverty and hopelessness prevail, it becomes a breeding ground for crime, drug use, and all that goes with it.

It was the same not only in New Orleans but it was the same sense of hopelessness, despair, and high crime in the East Lake community in downtown Atlanta. The East Lake public housing project was considered so dangerous that police refused to go on patrol there. Then a visionary named Tom Cousins, an Atlanta developer, came up with an idea: Why not replace a failed project with a 21st-century approach to housing, very similar to what we have done with HOPE VI? The answer was to create a public-private partnership emphasizing mixed use. With the help of HUD, the Atlanta housing authority and Tom Cousins and others totally transformed East Lake. They tore down the old projects. Yes, they tore down the old projects. They had to demolish some of those units.

This bill restricts our ability to tear down old units. There are 2,000 units in New Orleans that were not habitable that we have said we are going to go in and instead of replacing them with something new, something modern, something that offers hope, we are simply going to replace what existed there.

They tore down the old projects. They built new housing, and they

opened a new school. Now doctors and lawyers live next door to those whose housing is subsidized. In the old projects, there was only about a two-thirds' occupancy level. The occupancy level in New Orleans is very low because of the shoddy condition of the housing. Now 100 percent of the subsidized units are occupied, and the overall occupancy rate is 93.5 percent.

But something much greater than that, occupancy levels shouldn't be our main concern. It should be the condition of the people that are living there, their standard of living. Crime in the neighborhood has gone from the worst in Atlanta, 56 out of 56, the worst of 56 precincts, down to the 11th best precinct. Now, this is an area of mixed-use public housing which is actually one of the safest areas of Atlanta. The neighborhood has literally come back from the dead. But it wouldn't have happened if we had simply gone in like we propose to do in New Orleans and put it back exactly like it existed. In the end we are serving more low-income residents than we would if we had just replaced one on one.

But it isn't just happening in East Lake. Centennial Place in Atlanta is another success story, and the same transformation took place in Birmingham, and is taking place, with the Metropolitan Gardens development, a neighborhood that is now brightened by a new school, new housing, and a new YMCA.

It can be done. The Housing Authority of New Orleans has been dysfunctional for nearly 50 years. There is understandably a lot of anger and mistrust among the residents of New Orleans public housing after so many broken promises. But the anger, their anger and ours, should be channeled into moving forward in the direction of decent houses and safe communities.

HUD has a design for mixed-use communities similar to East Lake, Centennial, and Metropolitan Gardens. But that approach was rejected by the committee majority in favor of the one-to-one replacement of the old houses, in the same place, in the same location, in the same conditions. It is time to do better and we must.

This bill does not meet our imperative to the people of New Orleans public housing. If the concern is that some residents who want to return to New Orleans may not have a home to come back to, we can make provisions for that, but not into the old communities of high crime and hopelessness and despair. One-to-one is not the only way to bring people back, nor is it the best way or the more imaginative or innovative way. What will bring people back is a good place to live where crime and fear have been replaced by hope and opportunity.

Let me close simply by saying no matter what your party is, no matter what your political philosophy is, New Orleans can serve all of us as a model for improving our inner-city areas, those areas throughout America today,

high-crime areas, widespread drug use, high unemployment. But more important than all those statistics, let us improve the standard of living for those people in those communities, not only in New Orleans but throughout this country. And our obligation should not end with this bill today. It ought to continue next week. We ought to continue to look at it until we do it right.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

We agree on all the things the gentleman from Alabama said we should do. Nothing in this bill stops them from doing it.

All we say is this: please don't tear down the houses that people now live in before you replace them. We are not in any way opposed to that; but if you don't think the housing the people live in now is great, and neither do I, understand that they are only there because they can't get anything better, and that is the only point of difference. We are saying do not displace them before that nice, new stuff is ready.

And as for one-for-one, we aren't saying it has to be one-for-one right on-site. If you get a one-for-one replacement that is in mixed housing, that will be fine; but just don't displace people.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007. This bill is just another example of the commitment of this Congress to rebuild the city of New Orleans and the towns and cities surrounding it.

I thank Chairman FRANK and subcommittee Chair WATERS for their outstanding leadership on this legislation. I also thank my Republican colleagues who came down to New Orleans with our chairlady and who did an outstanding job for our people. And I thank them all for the urgency they attached to the housing issues in our region.

The affordable housing rental units lost in Katrina represented about 30 percent of the destroyed or severely damaged rental housing in a city that had 60 percent renters before the storm. The crisis of affordable housing in the gulf coast has prevented tens of thousands of families from returning, and that is addressed by this bill substantially. Additionally, more than 4,000 families that resided in public housing have not returned because their developments remain closed despite their having valid leases with their rent paid on time. Some have made their way back to the city only to discover their units boarded up and padlocked.

Two 60-year-old identical twins, Gloria Williams and Bobbie Jennings, came to Washington to explain what happened to them after Katrina. These women lived in adjacent apartments in

the C.J. Peete public housing development for 24 years. After they were forced to evacuate for Katrina, they were relocated six times. For several months they were separated. They said it was the first time in their lives that they had ever been apart.

HUD officials said the development should be torn down, but the women said they have cleaned their units of modest storm damage and believe they are habitable again.

As Mr. FRANK has pointed out, nothing in this bill prevents mixed housing or prevents reform or redevelopment. What we are most concerned about is that people right now have a chance to return home today, tomorrow, as opposed to a building that is going to be built within the next 3 to 5 years. To do as HUD has proposed across all public housing units in New Orleans is tantamount to forced homelessness.

It has been 19 months since the people of New Orleans and surrounding parishes were forced out across 48 States through no fault of their own. It is now time for everyone who wants to come home to come home. Without passage of this bill, we are giving our implied consent to the permanent exile of residents who only wish to enjoy the same rights and privileges to a home that everyone else across the country would want to enjoy. This bill makes the road home smoother for our people and helps a great deal toward getting our people back home.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the deputy ranking member of the Financial Services Committee and who also traveled to New Orleans and Mississippi.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member BIGGERT of the subcommittee for yielding.

And I also want to rise and thank Chairwoman WATERS, the subcommittee chairman of Housing, for having the hearings down in New Orleans and over in Mississippi. I see a number of Members in the Chamber that went on that trip. That was a very positive trip. But I think what we learned while we were down there is we share some common feelings about the recovery. And I think that was the frustration that we shared while we were down there where we saw very little progress in one area and a lot of progress in the other. In fact, I have said to my colleagues back home that this is a tale of two recoveries: the recovery or lack of recovery in New Orleans in Louisiana and the recovery that is going on in Mississippi.

I want to associate myself with some of the words the ranking member just made on the floor awhile ago about the model that needs to take place in New Orleans when we are talking about going back and building new housing. Some of the proposals that some of the people put forward while we were in New Orleans would not meet criteria

for a new federally subsidized housing project today. We don't do that anymore. We don't create these huge pockets where we have impoverished people where we see high crime, and we now go to mixed projects that provide communities that give diversity to those.

□ 1530

New Orleans faced a great devastation from the fact that they had a catastrophic hurricane. But now they have a great opportunity to rebuild, really starting in many places with a clean piece of paper. Can this be done without some disruption? No, it cannot, because the disruption has already taken place. And there are people who do want to return to New Orleans and to Louisiana, and there are people who may not return.

But what we do owe the American people, and I appreciate the fact that Ranking Member BIGGERT laid out a very clear outline of what this Congress has done to step up to meet the needs of the people that were affected by this hurricane, and the list is long, and the money is great, what we owe the American people is to make sure that we take that money now that we have put in place for Katrina and make sure it gets spent appropriately and that it benefits the people for which it is intended.

One of the things that concerns me about this bill is that every time we stand up and get into a discussion about Katrina, we have to authorize more money. In fact, this bill authorizes \$1.3 billion in new money. But money is really not the issue in Louisiana and New Orleans.

Now, I will admit and agree with the chairman, Chairman FRANK, that there are some things in this bill that clean up some administrative issues that probably need to take place. But let me tell you, the reason there is not recovery in New Orleans today is not because the United States Congress hasn't passed this bill. What they need in New Orleans and in Louisiana is probably leadership more than they need more money. But this bill does address some of that.

There are some amendments that were offered in our committee, in our markup, and I want to say this to Chairman FRANK, that we had a very good markup. He ran that meeting well and allowed a lot of amendments, and we had good debate and conversations about that, and I appreciate that. But there are amendments that are in this bill that make it more fiscally responsible and make it less micromanaging.

One of the things I get concerned about is we have got a Congress right now that wants to run the war in Iraq, and now we have a Congress that wants to run the recovery in New Orleans. What we do know is that we have to set out some parameters for that.

What the people need in New Orleans is to get started. Hopefully they will begin to do that. We saw some signs they were moving in that direction.

But what I would say to my colleagues is that what we have to do is at some point in time say, you know, this is all of the money and resources that we are going to give to this cause until we see some tangible results. Unfortunately, when you look at what is going on in Louisiana right now, there are not tangible results. It would not be something that you would want to put more money into until you see some better stewardship of the dollars that have already been authorized. In fact, many of the dollars that we have already authorized have not been spent.

So what I want our colleagues to do today as they listen to this debate is make sure that we accomplish the goal of what was the original intent of H.R. 1227, and that was to fix some slight glitches in the process, but not to become more fiscally irresponsible.

In closing, I would just say there is an opportunity in New Orleans. But I will tell you, the American people that are watching this debate today, and I hear it when I go back home, they are saying, Congressman, how much more money are we going to have to put into this process until we begin to see some results?

As I was riding in with a cabdriver going to the hearing that the chairwoman had in New Orleans, I asked the cabdriver, what is going on in New Orleans? He said, nothing. I said, what is the problem? He said, we have no plan, we have no leadership.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say I agree with the gentleman that we should not be spending a lot more money where it has been badly spent. Also, I did not think we were going to be talking about Iraq until later in the week.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS for their hard work and dedication in helping the thousands of victims that have been left homeless by the hurricane on the gulf coast. Thank you for caring and wanting to take action.

I rise in support of the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act, H.R. 1227. Eighteen months have passed since Katrina hit, yet thousands are still struggling to get back on their feet. This bill is about the thousands of people struggling to get back on their feet.

Last year, the TriCaucus Chairs, GRACE NAPOLITANO, MIKE HONDA and MEL WATT, met in Houston to cohost a townhall meeting on Katrina, where they listened to Katrina victims who had been displaced to Houston. Since then, we have learned that 99,000 families are still living in trailers, including 65,000 in Louisiana, 31,000 in Mississippi, and thousands more individ-

uals are still living with relatives in States throughout the Nation.

Families, workers and businesses can't return to the gulf area until they have homes to return to. We need to rebuild. Their lives are being impacted, and it is affecting their ability to improve their quality of life. This is their home. This is their castle. We need to rebuild.

The administration's slow response has been a major factor in the pace of recovery. The President didn't even mention Katrina in his 2007 State of the Union Address. Billions of dollars are going to rebuild Iraq, while American families are waiting for assistance right here at home in America. Shame.

Enough is enough. We can't afford to leave these families behind. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1227.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), who has probably seen much more of the devastation than we can ever imagine.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for her courtesy.

I rise today to make observation that when a hurricane makes landfall, most people do not consider it a Republican or a Democratic event; that in the aftermath, when you have been devastated from life and property and someone comes to help, you don't ask, are you from local government, State government or Federal Government, and, by the way, are you a Republican or a Democrat?

The only thing I observed that hurricanes and government have in common at this point as a Louisianian is that either one you touch, you are going to come away confused, disoriented and possibly hopeless.

We can do better. I should be quick to add, however, lest these comments be misinterpreted, that it was President Bush's administration who came to this Congress and asked for the \$100 billion of taxpayer money to begin the long, slow process of recovery. I also want to quickly add that it was Chairman FRANK who discussed with me the administrative problems of the resolution and incorporated into the bill now before us important expediting processes which will make a measurable and financial difference to the people of Louisiana.

I want to express my appreciation to Chairwoman WATERS and Ranking Member BIGGERT for their continued effort to understand and respond.

Not to dismiss that there are problems. In fact, a provision I was trying to include in the bill, which was made reference to during the debate on the rule, caused the CBO to express concern that we had a scoring problem. To make sure I say this the way I intend it, I learned that the CBO scoring process is mystical, algorithmic, nonsensical, opaque process intended to obstinately delegate common sense to irrelevance.

Short-circuiting all of that, let me say I appreciate Chairman FRANK's



staff working diligently and the Rules Committee allowing that provision to be made in order and to be included in this legislation.

That problem is not the only one for taxpayers. Let me explain to you that when you send us a dollar, we don't get a dollar. At best, we get 80 cents, because FEMA has been keeping at least 20 percent of all the money intended to help people recover for their operational expenses. The American public needs to know that, that we are not wasting \$100 billion. Certainly we can be more efficient in rolling out a response to a devastation that we have seen never before in this country, 90,000 square miles. I would say where we are today is not a hopeless mess, but indeed it is a mess.

My hope is that the small pilot program contained in this legislation, which will enable the collection of disparate tracts of property to be cleaned off and sold back into the private market, can be a way to kick-start a free-market recovery that to date has been impossible with government interference and obstinate regulation. There is a faster, better way, a more efficient way, to combat this scale of devastation and human suffering.

Maximizing taxpayer expenditures while minimizing benefits to those in need doesn't seem possible to the extent that we have seen in the current circumstance. If there is to be any long-term benefit to the resolution of this matter for all the affected taxpayers around this country, it is to construct a response mechanism that when the next devastating event occurs, we will be able to deploy resources, get people the help they need in an efficient manner, and get government the heck out of the way and let free markets function.

The bill before us today incorporates provisions that I believe will help get us closer to that goal. Are we there yet? Of course not.

Webster charges this House of Representatives with a very clear mission: Let us develop the resources of this land, call forth her powers, build up her institutions, promote all her great interests, and see whether we also in this, our day and generation, may perform something to be worthy of remembering.

Webster got it. We need to leave this place in a better condition than when we found it. We can do better than this. And before the next disaster strikes, we must.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to thank the gentleman for his work on this and to say that one of the things the gentleman talked about last year when I worked with him and we decided whoever would be in the majority, we need to straighten out going forward the FEMA-HUD relationship with regard to housing. Part of the problem is, in fairness to FEMA, they should not still be in the housing business. That was not their expertise.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would just observe the gentleman is absolutely correct. There is FEMA-ese and HUD-ese and they don't apparently have a translator.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we will work that out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his important leadership on this bill.

I rise in strong support of the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act. This bill was marked up earlier this month in the Financial Services Committee and was passed by a strong bipartisan vote.

I not only thank the chairman and Ranking Member BACHUS, but Chairwoman WATERS and Ranking Member BIGGERT. Chairwoman WATERS led many hearings and meetings and conferences on this, going to New Orleans and Mississippi, meeting with the families, with the authorities, and working with really great devotion and determination to move this bill to the floor to help the people in the gulf region.

This bill is a victory for those people who have suffered so greatly not only through Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, but an awe-inspiring amount of bureaucratic red tape, trying to get the help and the assistance that they need.

This bill will finally provide comprehensive housing relief for the hurricane-impacted areas of the gulf coast, and it will expedite and move forward and cut through the red tape so that the money and the services get to the people they were intended for.

It provides increased flexibility and oversight, while preserving Federal housing assistance and providing assistance to landowners and communities who helped evacuees. It provides flexibility by freeing up \$1.2 billion in funds for Louisiana's Road Home program for which FEMA is currently withholding use by transferring the funds to the Community Development Block Grant account, and it eliminates an unnecessary restriction imposed by the prior Congress against CDBG funds being used to meet matching requirements under other Federal programs.

It increases oversight by requiring the Louisiana Recovery Authority, the entity that administers the Road Home program, to report on their progress every 30 days on exactly what they are doing to help the people.

□ 1545

It preserves Federal housing assistance by including a number of provisions to rebuild the stock of affordable housing and to ensure that the administration will not shrink the level of housing assistance that supports that housing stock.

It provides assistance to communities that assisted evacuees by authorizing reimbursement for communities that used their own CDBG funds to provide rental assistance to evacuees after the storms hit, and it also provides such reimbursement to landowners who assisted the people.

This is a good bill. It cuts through the red tape. It provides assistance to the people, and I congratulate all who worked on it, particularly the Chair of the subcommittee, Ms. WATERS.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that going down there was quite an experience and something I never would have dreamed had happened. To see that firsthand, to go into the public housing and to see the interiors that had been sitting there for over 18 months that had been underwater for several days, particularly in New Orleans. In Mississippi, it was just a storm surge so the wall of water went in and then it went out, taking with it the homes.

But in New Orleans where the water sat, and to see the debris that was left inside, the clothes, the furniture, the food and cupboards and the mold will take an enormous amount of fixing.

When I was talking about it to someone, they asked, Are the cars still in the trees? I said, No, the cars have been removed from the trees, but the buildings are still standing just as they were untouched. So it is a big job.

As Ranking Member BACHUS said about finding mixed-use housing, to move public housing into the 21st century I think should be all of our goals, to be able to provide a place where those who need subsidized housing can live in what would be a larger unit. The units that we saw were tiny. Water heaters were in the kitchen next to the stove with all of the wires where little kids would be playing. So to have larger units for a family, to have open spaces, and to have the services.

Right now they are in a quandary because people want to come back, but there is no housing. People want workers in their community, and there is no place for the workers to live. So until we can break this cycle, and that is what takes leadership from those that are in the community, to break that cycle so there is housing, there are workers, and there are services.

At least seven hospitals were destroyed in New Orleans. They don't have the medical services or the groceries stores. So even if someone comes back, and they have restored some of the housing and some of the units, they may remain empty because they are living in a place that is almost empty and there are no services. You can't just go to the grocery store. We have to jump-start this, and I think this bill goes well on its way to get over the bureaucracy and to have the leadership, the grass-roots leadership, begin to do that.

In Mississippi we saw a different situation where the storm came in and out.

All you see are slabs and concrete stairs from those slabs going to nowhere. About the only thing remaining were oak trees, beautiful, beautiful oak trees that did survive. All of the other foliage is gone.

There they have been able to rebuild. A lot has been done. Maybe it is because houses didn't sit in the water. The water came and went, and they were able to remove the debris. But there I think we had some of the leadership that is needed on the local level.

From the hearings, it gave us hope. After 18 months, they have the money. Congress has done their job and we will be able to get them back on a track and not set precedents that will be unwieldy if there are other such disasters.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, the Chair of the housing subcommittee, as well as the ranking members.

I used to serve on both of these committees when I was on Financial Services, and my heart longs to address many of the same issues. From the Ways and Means Committee, I hope to try to do some of that.

I have traveled to the Hurricane Katrina area on three occasions. The first time I went, I went to visit some of the folks that were put out of their homes and they were staying in arenas across Houston and across Baton Rouge and across New Orleans.

The second time I went, I went with Leader PELOSI when a group of us had an opportunity to tour the areas about 9 months later. I sat down and talked with officials.

The third time I was there when the people of New Orleans were dying to have an opportunity to vote for the mayoral candidate of their choice.

Louisiana is important to me because a lot of my father's and mother's friends lived in Louisiana when they grew up in Alabama. But the thing I think we need to remember about Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, that is America. That is the United States of America, and the people of those communities deserve to be treated royally. They deserve to have the services and housing that they need. I think that this piece of legislation goes towards that effort.

More importantly, I have run into people from Louisiana who say, Congresswoman TUBBS JONES, I want to help rebuild New Orleans, but somehow I have to be gone. I want to come back and live, and people are coming from all over the world working in New Orleans rebuilding my hometown. I want to be there to have the opportunity to do that.

I believe this legislation gives us an opportunity to do that as well.

I have introduced a piece of legislation, H.R. 1043, which is called the

Community Restoration and Revitalization Act of 2007. What that legislation does is allows us to use the historic preservation tax credit in conjunction with low-income housing tax credit so that when we rebuild the historic areas of New Orleans, we won't just rebuild for the people who are coming in with money who want to live in those areas, the gentrified areas; but there will be dollars to provide for people who stayed in the community and want to be there for a while and need to be able to afford to live in those areas.

This is an important day for us. Just as we rebuilt New York after 9/11 and everybody bought into the process, and I don't make a comparison between 9/11 and a hurricane, but what I will say to you is that the people of this area are Americans just like the rest of us, and they need a place to live, and they need to be able to bring their children back and restore that culture that is so rich a part of the United States of America.

I stand here today encouraging, urging, pleading with my colleagues to not let this opportunity pass. Don't let it be said that on March 20, 2007, when your children and grandchildren asked where were you and what did you do for the people of New Orleans, Mississippi and Alabama, and you say, I did nothing.

I am glad to stand here in support of the legislation. I celebrate my colleagues and thank you for an opportunity to be heard.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act and commend my colleague Congresswoman Waters and the Financial Services Committee for bringing this very important legislation to the House floor today.

The devastation of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma has required an unprecedented response from the Federal, state and local governments, as well as the private sector. While, there has been progress, there is still widespread dissatisfaction in the government's response to providing emergency and long-term recovery, especially housing. There are still tens of thousands of families that cannot return to their homes or any home because there is still a major crisis in the public housing sector. As their needs were not met in the immediate wake of the storm, many of the former residents of public housing units in the Gulf Coast have continued to find their needs severely neglected over the past 19 months.

The Gulf Coast Recovery Act addresses the concerns that were expressed by disaster victims at hearings held in the affected areas. This bill includes provisions that will address the crisis of affordable housing in the Gulf Coast, including freeing up \$1.175 billion appropriated for the Louisiana Road Home program. Another important provision is the extension of the September deadline that would cutoff 12,000 families currently receiving Disaster Voucher Program assistance. This also helps the thousands of citizens who generously opened their homes to those in need, when our own government did not step up to the plate to assist.

Relief, recovery and reconstruction efforts for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma are on-

going—and will continue until the Gulf Coast is completely up and running again and all displaced victims are once again living in a permanent home. H.R. 1227 helps us to achieve this goal. I urge passage of the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007. Among other things, this legislation includes provisions designed to speed up the repair and rebuilding of homes and affordable rental housing in areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma; ensures continued rental assistance for both families that have moved back to their home areas and for families displaced by such hurricanes, and provides reimbursements to communities and landlords that were generous in providing assistance to hurricane evacuees in the aftermath of the storms.

Mr. Chairman, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita hit landfall in 2005. In the immediate aftermath of the storms, Congress provided substantial sums through the Federal Emergency Management Administration, FEMA, to address emergency needs arising from the devastation that the storms created, and to provide a housing safety net for families who lost their homes or were otherwise displaced. Later in 2005 and in the summer of 2006, Congress approved two emergency spending bills providing more than \$16 billion in CDBG funds for affected states, to provide assistance for home repairs and reconstruction and for repair and rebuilding of a depleted stock of affordable rental housing. Congress also appropriated \$390 million for the Disaster Voucher Program, which provides voucher assistance to formerly HUD-assisted families that have been displaced by these hurricanes.

However, some 18 months after these storms, the pace of recovery of housing repair and reconstruction is not as robust in many areas as many had hoped. The pace of home repair, particularly in areas within Louisiana, has been slow. The repair or rebuilding of many damaged federally subsidized public and assisted housing units, affordable to lower income families, has still not taken place. And, tens of thousands of federally assisted evacuees from these hurricanes face impending deadlines later this year for continued eligibility for rental assistance.

The Financial Services Committee has held a number of hearings over the past year and a half, including two in September 2005, two in December 2005, two in January 2006, one in February 2006, and three in February 2007 to explore the pace of the housing recovery effort in the Gulf Coast. The hearings included representatives of Federal agencies, State and local government officials, housing developers, nonprofit organizations, and representatives of low income housing. Witnesses testified as to the current state of the housing recovery in various communities in the Gulf Coast and offered legislative suggestions for addressing housing problems in those areas. The bill ultimately reported out of the Financial Services Committee relies extensively on the hearing record and these suggestions.

#### FLEXIBILITY

H.R. 1227 includes a number of provisions designed to improve flexibility with respect to previously appropriated funds for hurricane recovery efforts on the Gulf Coast. The bill would free up for use \$1.175 billion in funds

previously made available for use to the State of Louisiana under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, but which has been held up by FEMA. Louisiana has proposed combining these funds with CDBG funds under its Road Home program for grants to homeowners, but FEMA will not approve use of the funds because of Road Home provisions that provide incentives for homeowners to commit to returning to the state to live. Under the program, homeowners would receive a 40 percent reduction in any Road Home grant money if they leave the state. However, this provision excepts homeowners over the age of 65. The bill would transfer such funds to CDBG, to expedite the availability of such funds.

The bill eliminates an unduly restrictive “duplication of benefits” provision that has resulted in homeowners in Louisiana receiving less than the funds they need to rebuild under the Road Home Program, while instating a prohibition against any person receiving a “windfall gain” from assistance under that program.

The bill eliminates a provision from a previous CDBG appropriations bill that prohibits CDBG funds from being used as a match for other Federal programs, a change that could help cash strapped communities without a tax base that are unable to meet these other match requirements.

The bill provides that \$15 million in CDBG funds made available to the State of Louisiana shall be transferred to the New Orleans Redevelopment Agency, for a pilot program to leverage private capital to assemble, redevelop and resell parcels of land in New Orleans.

Finally, the bill expedites the handling of loss claims for lenders in the case of FHA insured 1- to 4-unit properties where there are problems with the conveyance of title.

#### PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

H.R. 1227 includes a number of provisions designed to preserve the supply of rental housing that is affordable for low income families. The bill requires HUD to give timely approval of all feasible requests to restore project-based rental assistance or transfer such assistance to another site, in the case of damaged or destroyed federally assisted housing developments. The bill authorizes 4,500 new housing vouchers for the purpose of project based assistance for supportive housing units for seniors, disabled persons, and the homeless. The bill requires HUD to provide replacement vouchers for every public housing and assisted housing unit that is not brought back on line.

Similarly, with respect to public housing, the bill provides resident protections and preserves the availability of public housing units in hurricane affected areas by preventing the transfer of such units without preserving long term affordability requirements. It also conditions demolition of public housing units on providing alternative housing units for residents of the units being demolished and on replacing such units either with other public housing or with comparable units providing comparable affordability for low income residents.

Specifically, with respect to the Housing Authority of New Orleans, the bill also requires the Authority to survey pre-Katrina residents to identify which residents want to return and when, and to provide public housing or comparable units to those residents that want to return, but in any case no less than 3,000 units by August 1st. Funding is also author-

ized for repair, rehabilitation, and development of HANO public housing units.

The bill also authorizes \$5 million in each of the next two years for Fair Housing activities, to ensure that housing activities in areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita are carried out in a manner that furthers fair housing.

#### RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Faced with a looming September deadline for the cutoff of some 12,000 families currently receiving Disaster Voucher Program (DVP) assistance, H.R. 1227 extends this deadline through at least the end of the year, and authorizes replacement vouchers to affected families when the program terminates, which will continue as long as the family is eligible for voucher assistance.

These vouchers are attached to each individual and family and will “disappear” when the individual or family is no longer eligible for the assistance. The bill also provides a clarification that HUD should make adjustments in the voucher formula funding allocation changes made in the Continuing Resolution, so that Gulf Coast housing agencies will not be adversely impacted by the hurricanes.

The Continuing Resolution provided such authority for HUD to make such adjustments, and this bill requires the adjustments be made. Finally, the bill requires HUD to make a good faith effort to identify families that are eligible for Disaster Voucher Assistance but are not receiving such assistance, and make such assistance available.

#### OVERSIGHT

H.R. 1227 includes a number of provisions to ensure that Federal funds are used efficiently, effectively, and legally. The bill requires the State of Louisiana to submit monthly reports on the progress of the Road Home program in making funds available to homeowners. The bill requires the General Accountability Office (GAO) to complete quarterly reports identifying any waste, fraud, and abuse in connection with the program. And, the bill requires a GAO study to examine methods of improving the distribution of Federal housing funds to assist states with hurricane recovery efforts.

Finally, the bill requires that any funds used under Title II with respect to public housing construction or repair must have verification that all workers have an immigration status that allows them to be legally employed.

#### REIMBURSEMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LANDLORDS THAT ASSISTED EVACUEES

A number of communities and private sector landlords throughout the country played a critical role in providing housing assistance to evacuees in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. This assistance was critical at a time when housing was in short supply and hundreds of thousands of families were displaced. It is important to encourage such actions in future disasters.

Therefore, H.R. 1227 authorizes funding for reimbursement of localities that used their own CDBG funds to provide rental housing assistance to such evacuees. The bill also authorizes reimbursement to landlords who participated in the FEMA Section 403 program under which local communities co-signed private lease agreements—but who suffered financial losses arising from FEMA subsequently breaking their agreement to provide reimbursements under this program.

For all these reasons, I am proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 1227 and I urge all

members to vote in favor of this important and much needed legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1227, the “Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007.” This legislation institutes long overdue reforms in our response to the devastation that hurricanes have inflicted on the Gulf Coast region.

I have been an outspoken critic of the way this Administration has mismanaged Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, and their resulting aftermath.

Anyone who has traveled to the Ninth Ward in New Orleans, as I have, can tell you about overwhelming devastation in that community. Entire city blocks were flattened, with their rooftops smashed and scattered on the ground.

The lives of millions were similarly fractured, when governmental systems that were already weak broke down under the pressure from the storm.

The entire Nation and the world watched with dismay as news reports chronicled the gross mismanagement and abuse thrust upon the people of New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

I told President Bush then that I did not think God would be pleased with our response to the disaster.

Sadly, I am not convinced that He would be pleased with our current response.

One and a half years after the hurricane hit, thousands of Americans remain displaced, their lives and families torn apart first by the storm, and second by the resulting bureaucratic mismanagement.

We do not know for sure how many families remain displaced, but our most conservative estimates indicate that at least 150,000 are still affected.

Make no mistake: The people of the Gulf Coast region want to return home, but many of them cannot find affordable housing to which to return.

Public housing was decimated by the storm. Approximately 70 percent of the 300,000 homes that were severely damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Katrina belonged to low-income families.

Homeowners who want to return have been asked to do the impossible. We have appropriated the necessary funds to help rebuild the region, but the money has yet to trickle down to the people.

Today, we will take an important step in rectifying this situation by considering the “Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007.”

The bill would institute much needed reforms, including: freeing up \$1.2 billion in funds for Louisiana’s Road Home Program, a program that compensates eligible displaced homeowners up to \$150,000 for their losses; providing a stock of affordable housing by prohibiting the demolition of public housing until there is a plan in place to replace the current units; and most importantly, extending the Disaster Voucher Program, DVP, for former public housing and Section 8 voucher holders, until January 2008.

We have a moral obligation to restore a sense of normalcy to those whose lives have been affected by storms in the Gulf Coast region. They have already suffered for far too long.

For this reason, I support and will be voting in favor of H.R. 1227, the “Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007.”

I would like to thank Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS and Chairman BARNEY FRANK for their leadership in introducing this vitally important legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I stand today in opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007. The stated goal of H.R. 1227—to facilitate the speedy recovery of renters and homeowners who are still displaced by Hurricane Katrina—is a worthy one. However, this legislation will not achieve this goal, and will in fact make matters worse.

The Disaster Voucher Program is currently a temporary program, but H.R. 1227 would extend it into a permanent voucher. Furthermore, it would require HUD to provide tenant replacement vouchers for all public housing units not brought back on line, including those slated for demolition prior to the storms. In other words, this bill mandates the reconstruction of a previously flawed public housing system in New Orleans, rather than addressing root problems and looking for new solutions.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1227 not only calls for the reconstruction of a failed system, but it does so in a very costly manner. The CBO estimates that H.R. 1227 would increase direct spending by \$224 million in 2007 and by \$469 million between 2007 and 2012.

H.R. 1227 simply ignores “pay-as-you-go” rules and provides new funding without finding a way to pay for it. Chairman FRANK, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Financial Services, has stated that H.R. 1227 was symbolic of a commitment to helping the poor no matter what other priorities Congress has. Rather than offering those who face hardship a symbolic and irresponsible gesture, we should be looking at ways to encourage reform of New Orleans’ public housing system and ensure a workable, sustainable program that actually meets the city’s needs for quality housing.

In the 109th Congress, the Republican Majority put in place a system to do exactly that. We provided more than \$110 billion to hurricane-devastated Gulf Coast, including \$16.7 billion for the Community Development Block Grant program. However, rather than simply attempt to re-establish a failed system, we required that states develop a comprehensive plan for addressing their housing needs. We demanded accountability, so that Katrina victims would have quality housing to return to.

As HUD Secretary Jackson said last year, everyone who wants to return home to New Orleans should be allowed to do so. The Republican Majority offered the opportunity for a better home to return to. We should be focusing on how to implement a comprehensive, long-term plan to address this range of issues that challenge the Gulf Region. We can accomplish much of this with the funds that we already made available in the previous Congress. This bill, however, simply appropriates new funds to recreate old failures. It is not a solution; it is the perpetuation of problems.

Mr. Chairman, Members were given notice late Friday that their amendments to H.R. 1227 would be due by early Monday morning. Hardly enough time for Members to formulate substantive amendments. I requested last night during the Rules Committee hearing that we grant this bill a modified open rule—one that allows any Member the opportunity to

submit their amendments for consideration by preprinting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the day before. Unfortunately, we were denied, amendments were shut out yet again, and I believe this bill could suffer for it.

Mr. Chairman, again, I oppose this restrictive rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 110–53, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

#### H.R. 1227

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007”.*

#### SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON USE OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS.

*None of the amounts authorized by this Act may be used to lobby or retain a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer.*

#### TITLE I—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

#### SEC. 101. FLEXIBILITY OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR ROAD HOME PROGRAM.

*(a) PROHIBITION OF RESTRICTION ON USE OF AMOUNTS.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may not prohibit or restrict the use, by the State of Louisiana under the Road Home Program of such State, of any amounts specified in paragraph (3) based upon the existence or extent of any requirement or condition under such program that—*

*(A) limits or reduces the amount made available to an eligible homeowner who does not agree to remain an owner and occupant of a home in Louisiana; or*

*(B) waives the applicability of any limitation or reduction referred to in subparagraph (A) for homeowners who are elderly or senior citizens.*

*(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), all other provisions of section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c) shall apply to amounts specified in paragraph (3) that are used by the State of Louisiana under the Road Home Program of such State.*

*(3) COVERED AMOUNTS.—The amounts specified in this paragraph are any amounts provided for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita under the Hazard Mitigation Grant program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the State of Louisiana.*

*(b) REPORTS.—*

*(1) LOUISIANA ROAD HOME PROGRAM.—The State of Louisiana shall submit reports under this subsection regarding the Road Home Program of such State to the Committees identified in paragraph (5). Each such report under this subsection shall describe and analyze the implementation, status, and effectiveness of the Road Home Program and shall include the information described in paragraph (3) regarding such program, for the applicable reporting period and for the entire period of the program.*

*(2) OTHER STATES’ HOUSEHOLD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS FUNDED WITH CDBG DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—Each State that received amounts made available under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in chapter 9 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2779) or under such heading in chapter 9 of title II of Public Law 109–234 (120 Stat. 472) shall submit reports under this subsection regarding each grant program of the State for assistance for individual households funded in whole or in part with such amounts to the Committees identified in paragraph (5). Each such report under this subsection shall describe and analyze the implementation, status, and effectiveness of each such grant program and shall include the information described in paragraph (3) regarding each such program, for the applicable reporting period and for the entire period of such program.*

*(3) CONTENTS.—The information described in this paragraph with respect to a program is the following information:*

*(A) The number of applications submitted for assistance under the program.*

*(B) The number of households for which assistance has been provided under the program.*

*(C) The average amount of assistance provided for each household under the program and the total amount of assistance provided under the program.*

*(D) The number of personnel involved in executing all aspects of the program.*

*(E) Actions taken to improve the program and recommendations for further such improvements.*

*(4) REPORTING PERIODS.—With respect to any program described in paragraph (1) or (2), the first report under this subsection shall be submitted not later than the expiration of the 30-day period that begins upon the date of the enactment of this Act. Reports shall be submitted, during the term of each such program, not later than the expiration of each successive (A) 30-day period thereafter, in the case of the program described in paragraph (1), and (B) calendar quarter thereafter, in the case of the programs described in paragraph (2).*

*(5) RECEIVING COMMITTEES.—The Committees specified in this paragraph are—*

*(A) the Committees on Financial Services and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and*

*(B) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.*

*(c) NEW ORLEANS REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PILOT PROGRAM.—*

*(1) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall require the State of Louisiana to make available, from any amounts made available for such State under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in chapter 9 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2779) or under such heading in chapter 9 of title II of Public Law 109–234 (120 Stat. 472) and that remain unexpended, \$15,000,000 to the New Orleans Redevelopment Authority (in this subsection referred to as the “Redevelopment Authority”), subject to paragraph (3), only for use to carry out the pilot program under this subsection.*

*(2) PURPOSE.—The pilot program under this subsection shall fund, through the combination of amounts provided under this subsection with public and private capital from other sources, the purchase or costs associated with the acquisition or disposition of individual parcels of land in New Orleans, Louisiana, by the Redevelopment Authority to be aggregated, assembled, and sold for the purpose of development by private entities only in accordance with, and subject to, the Orleans Parish Recovery Plan, developed and adopted by the City of New Orleans. The costs associated with acquisition or*

disposition of a parcel of land may include costs for activities described in paragraph (3)(C) with respect to such parcel and costs described in paragraph (3)(F).

(3) **CERTIFICATIONS.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may make amounts available pursuant to paragraph (1) to the Redevelopment Authority only upon the submission to the Secretary of certifications, sufficient in the determination of the Secretary to ensure that the Redevelopment Authority—

(A) has the authority to purchase land for resale for the purpose of development in accordance with the pilot program under this subsection;

(B) has bonding authority (either on its own or through a State bonding agency) or has credit enhancements sufficient to support public/private financing to acquire land for the purposes of the pilot program under this subsection;

(C) has the authority and capacity to ensure clean title to land sold under the pilot program and to reduce the risk attributable to and indemnify against environmental, flood, and other liabilities.

(D) will provide a first right to purchase any land acquired by the Redevelopment Authority to the seller who sold the land to the Redevelopment Authority;

(E) has in place sufficient internal controls to ensure that funds made available under this subsection may not be used to fund salaries or other administrative costs of the employees of the Redevelopment Authority; and

(F) will, in carrying out the pilot program under this subsection, consult with the Office of Recovery Management of the City of New Orleans regarding coordination of activities under the program with the Recovery Plan referred to in paragraph (2), reimbursement of such City for costs incurred in support of the program, and use of program income and other amounts generated through the program.

(4) **DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out the pilot program under this subsection, the Redevelopment Authority shall—

(A) sell land acquired under the pilot program only as provided in paragraph (2);

(B) use any proceeds from the sale of such land to replenish funds available for use under the pilot program for the purpose of acquiring new parcels of land or to repay any private financing for such purchases;

(C) sell land only—

(i) to purchasers who agree to develop such sites for sale to the public; or

(ii) to purchasers pursuant to paragraph (3)(D); and

(D) in the case of a purchaser of land pursuant to paragraph (3)(D), ensure that the developer of any adjacent parcels sold by the Redevelopment Authority makes an offer to the purchaser to develop such land for a fee.

(5) **INAPPLICABILITY OF STAFFORD ACT LIMITATIONS.**—Any requirements or limitations under or pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act relating to use of properties acquired with amounts made available under such Act for certain purposes, restricting development of such properties, or limiting subsequent alienation of such properties shall not apply to amounts provided under this subsection or properties acquired under the pilot program with such amounts.

(6) **GAO STUDY AND REPORT.**—Upon the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the pilot program carried out under this subsection to determine the effectiveness and limitations of, and potential improvements for, such program. Not later than 90 days after the expiration of such period, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Committees on Financial Services and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Homeland Security

and Governmental Affairs of the Senate regarding the results of the study.

(d) **ONGOING GAO REPORTS ON USE OF AMOUNTS.**—

(1) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—During the period that amounts referred to in subsection (a)(3) are being expended under the Road Home Program of the Louisiana Recovery Authority, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit reports on a quarterly basis to the Committees on Financial Services and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate. Such reports shall describe and account for the use of all such amounts expended during the applicable quarterly period and identify any waste, fraud, or abuse involved in the use of such amounts.

(2) **MONITORING.**—The Comptroller General shall monitor the total amount referred to in subsection (a)(3) that has been expended by such Authority and, pursuant to such monitoring—

(A) upon determining that at least two percent of such amount has been expended, shall include in the first quarterly report thereafter a written determination of such expenditure; and

(B) upon determining, at any time after the determination under subparagraph (A), that the portion of such total amount expended at such time that was subject to waste, fraud, or abuse exceeds 10 percent, shall include in the first quarterly report thereafter a certification to that effect.

(3) **ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**—If at any time the Comptroller General submits a report under paragraph (1) that includes a certification under paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall each hold hearings within 60 days to identify the reasons for such waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(B) the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Committees referred to in paragraph (1) within 90 days recommending actions to be taken to prevent further waste fraud and abuse in expenditure of such amounts.

#### **SEC. 102. TREATMENT OF BENEFITS FROM OTHER PROGRAMS UNDER ROAD HOME PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the extent that amounts made available under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in chapter 9 of title I of division B of Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2779), under such heading in chapter 9 of title II of Public Law 109–234 (120 Stat. 472), and under section 101 of this title, are used by the State of Louisiana under the Road Home program, the procedures preventing duplication of benefits established pursuant to the penultimate proviso under such heading in Public Law 109–148 (119 Stat. 2781) and the 15th proviso under such heading in Public Law 109–234 (120 Stat. 473) shall not apply with respect to any benefits received from hazard insurance, flood insurance, or disaster payments from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, except to the extent that the inapplicability of such procedures would result in a windfall gain under the Road Home Program to any person.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—During the period consisting of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall monitor the expenditure, under the Road Home Program, of amounts referred to in subsection (a) that were made available from Public Laws 109–148 and 109–234. If at any time during such period the cumulative outlays resulting from the inapplicability, pursuant to subsection (a), of the procedures referred to in such subsection

preventing duplication of benefits exceed \$1,250,000,000, the Secretary shall suspend the applicability of subsection (a) for the remainder of such period.

#### **SEC. 103. ELIMINATION OF PROHIBITION OF USE FOR MATCH REQUIREMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts made available before the date of the enactment of this Act for activities under the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) for expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure in the areas impacted or distressed by the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma in States for which the President declared a major disaster, or made available before such date of enactment for such activities for such expenses in the areas impacted or distressed by the consequences of Hurricane Dennis, may be used by a State or locality as a matching requirement, share, or contribution for any other Federal program.

(b) **EFFICIENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe, or Department of Hawaiian Home Lands uses amounts referred to in subsection (a), the release of which would otherwise be subject to environmental reviews under the procedures authorized under section 104(g) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)), to match or supplement the federal assistance provided under sections 402, 403, 406, 407, or 502 of Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency conducts an environmental review that encompasses all activities assisted by such matching funds, the Director's environmental review shall satisfy all of the environmental responsibilities that would otherwise be assumed by the State, unit of general local government, Indian tribe, or Department of Hawaiian Home Lands under such section 104(g), and the requirements and procedures of such provision, including assumption of environmental review responsibilities and submission and approval of a request for release of funds and certification, shall be inapplicable, if, prior to its commitment of any matching funds for such activities, the State, unit of general local government, Indian tribe, or Department of Hawaiian Home Lands notifies the Director and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development that it elects to defer to the Director's environmental review responsibilities. If a deferral is elected under this subsection, the Director shall be the responsible party for any liability under the applicable law if the environmental review as described in the preceding sentence is deficient in any manner.

#### **SEC. 104. REIMBURSEMENT OF CDBG AMOUNTS USED FOR RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**

There are authorized to be appropriated, from any amounts made available before the date of the enactment of this Act under any provision of law to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for disaster relief under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act relating to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma that remain unobligated, and from any amounts made available before such date of enactment under any provision of law to such Agency for such disaster relief relating to the consequences of Hurricane Dennis that remain unobligated, such sums as may be necessary, to be made available to the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for transfer to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, for such Secretary to provide assistance under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) to metropolitan cities and urban counties that used amounts previously

made available under such title to provide rental housing assistance for families residing in such city or county pursuant to evacuation from their previous residences because of such hurricanes in the amount necessary to provide each such city and county with an amount equal to the aggregate amount of previous assistance under such title so used.

## TITLE II—PUBLIC HOUSING

### SEC. 201. SURVEY OF PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS.

(a) SURVEY.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide for the conducting of a survey, using appropriate scientific research methods, by an independent entity or organization, to determine, of the households who as of August 28, 2005, resided in public housing (as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b))) operated or administered by the Housing Authority of New Orleans, in Louisiana—

(1) which and how many such households intend to return to residences in dwelling units described in section 202(d) of this Act, when presented with the options of—

(A) returning to residence in a repaired public housing or comparable dwelling unit in New Orleans; or

(B) continuing to receive rental housing assistance from the Federal Government; and

(2) when such households intend to return.

(b) PARTICIPATION OF RESIDENTS.—The Secretary shall solicit recommendations from resident councils and residents of public housing operated or administered by such Housing Authority in designing and conducting the survey under subsection (a).

(c) PROPOSED SURVEY DOCUMENT.—The Secretary shall submit the full research design of the proposed document to be used in conducting the survey to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate not less than 10 business days before the commencement of such survey.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report the Committees referred to in subsection (c) detailing the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

### SEC. 202. RIGHT OF RETURN FOR PREVIOUS RESIDENTS OF PUBLIC HOUSING.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE DWELLING UNITS.—Not later than August 1, 2007, the Housing Authority of New Orleans shall make available for occupancy, subject to subsection (b), a number of dwelling units (including those currently occupied) described in subsection (d) that is not less than the greater of—

(1) 3,000; or

(2) the number of households who have indicated, in the survey conducted pursuant to section 201, that they intend to return to residence in public housing operated or administered by such public housing agency.

(b) RIGHT OF RETURN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject only to subsection (c), the Housing Authority of New Orleans shall make available, upon the request of any household who, as of August 28, 2005, was a tenant of public housing operated or administered by such public housing agency, occupancy for such household in a dwelling unit provided pursuant to subsection (a). As a condition of exercising a right under this paragraph to occupancy in such a dwelling unit, not later than August 1, 2007, a tenant shall provide notice to such Housing Authority of intent to exercise such right and shall identify a date that the tenant intends to occupy such a dwelling unit, which shall not be later than October 1, 2007.

(2) PREFERENCES.—In making dwelling units available to households pursuant to paragraph (1), such Housing Authority shall provide preference to each such household for occupancy in a dwelling unit in the following locations, in the following order:

(A) A dwelling unit in the same public housing project occupied by the household as of August 28, 2005, if available.

(B) A dwelling unit in the same census tract in which was located the public housing dwelling unit occupied by the household as of August 28, 2005, if available.

(C) A dwelling unit in a census tract adjacent to the census tract in which was located the public housing dwelling unit occupied by the household as of August 28, 2005, if available.

(D) A dwelling unit in the neighborhood in which was located the public housing dwelling unit occupied by the household as of August 28, 2005, if available.

(c) PROHIBITION OF EXCLUSION.—The Housing Authority of New Orleans, and any other manager of replacement dwelling units set forth in this section shall not, including through the application of any waiting list or eligibility, screening, occupancy, or other policy or practice, prevent any household referred to in subsection (b)(1) from occupying a replacement dwelling unit provided pursuant to subsection (a), except to the extent that any other provision of Federal law prohibits occupancy or tenancy of such household in the type of housing of the replacement dwelling unit provided for such household.

(d) REPLACEMENT DWELLING UNITS.—A dwelling unit described in this subsection is—

(1) a dwelling unit in public housing operated or administered by the Housing Authority of New Orleans; or

(2) a dwelling unit in other comparable housing for which the amount required to be contributed by the tenant for rent is comparable to the amount required to be contributed by the tenant for rental of a comparable public housing dwelling unit.

(e) RELOCATION ASSISTANCE.—The Housing Authority of New Orleans shall provide, to each household provided occupancy in a dwelling unit pursuant to subsection (b), assistance under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policy Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.) for relocation to such dwelling unit.

### SEC. 203. ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT OF ALL PUBLIC HOUSING DWELLING UNITS.

(a) CONDITIONS ON DEMOLITION.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, the Housing Authority of New Orleans may not demolish or dispose of any dwelling unit of public housing operated or administered by such agency (including any uninhabitable unit and any unit previously approved for demolition) except pursuant to a plan for replacement of such units in accordance with, and approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to, subsection (b).

(b) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not approve a plan that provides for demolition or disposition of any dwelling unit of public housing referred to in subsection (a) unless—

(1) such plan is developed with the active participation of the resident councils of, and residents of public housing operated or administered by, such Housing Authority and with the City of New Orleans, at every phase of the planning and approval process, through a process that provides opportunity for comment on specific proposals for redevelopment, demolition, or disposition;

(2) not later than 60 days before the date of the approval of such plan, such Housing Authority has convened and conducted a public hearing regarding the demolition or disposition proposed in the plan;

(3) such plan provides that for each such dwelling unit demolished or disposed of, such public housing agency will provide an additional dwelling unit through—

(A) the acquisition or development of additional public housing dwelling units; or

(B) the acquisition, development, or contracting (including through project-based assistance) of additional dwelling units that are sub-

ject to requirements regarding eligibility for occupancy, tenant contribution toward rent, and long-term affordability restrictions which are comparable to public housing units;

(4) such plan provides for the implementation of a right for households to occupancy housing in accordance with section 202;

(5) such plan provides priority in making units available under paragraph (3) to residents identified in section 201;

(6) such plan provides that the proposed demolition or disposition and relocation will be carried out in a manner that affirmatively furthers fair housing, as described in subsection (e) of section 808 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968; and

(7) to the extent that such plan provides for the provision of replacement or additional dwelling units, or redevelopment, in phases over time, such plan provides that the ratio of dwelling units described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) that are provided in any such single phase to the total number of dwelling units provided in such phase is not less than the ratio of the aggregate number of such dwelling units provided under the plan to the total number of dwelling units provided under the plan.

(c) INAPPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—Subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) shall not apply with respect to vouchers used to comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(3) of this section.

(d) MONITORING.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide for the appropriate field offices of the Department to monitor and supervise enforcement of this section and plans approved under this section and to consult, regarding such monitoring and enforcement, with resident councils of, and residents of public housing operated or administered by, the Housing Authority of New Orleans and with the City of New Orleans.

### SEC. 204. PROTECTION FOR PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS IN HURRICANE AREAS.

(a) CONDITIONS ON TRANSFER.—During the two year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, a public housing agency may not transfer ownership of any public housing dwelling units described in subsection (h) unless the transferee enters into such binding commitments as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development considers necessary to maintain, for the longest feasible period, the requirements regarding eligibility for occupancy in such dwelling units and tenant contribution toward rent for such dwelling units that are applicable to such units as public housing dwelling units.

(b) CONDITIONS ON DEMOLITION.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, a public housing agency may not dispose or demolish any dwelling units described in subsection (h), except pursuant to a plan for replacement of such units in accordance with, and approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to, subsection (c).

(c) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not approve a plan that provides for demolition or disposition of any dwelling unit of public housing described in subsection (h) unless such plan complies with the requirements under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) of section 203(b), except that such paragraphs shall be applied for purposes this subsection by substituting “the public housing agency” and “applicable unit of general local government” for “such Housing Authority” and “City of New Orleans”, respectively.

(d) RELOCATION ASSISTANCE.—A public housing agency shall provide, to each household relocated pursuant to a plan under this section for demolition or disposition, assistance under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policy Act of 1970 for relocation to their new residence.



(e) **RIGHT OF RETURN.**—A public housing agency administering or operating public housing dwelling units described in subsection (h) has the obligation—

(1) to use its best efforts to locate tenants displaced from such public housing as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita; and

(2) to provide such residents occupancy in public housing dwelling units of such agency that become available for occupancy, and to ensure such residents a means to exercise such right of return.

(f) **INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROJECT-BASED VOUCHER LIMITATIONS.**—Subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437(o)(13)) shall not apply with respect to any project-based vouchers used to comply with the requirements of a plan under subsection (c).

(g) **PROHIBITION ON DISPLACEMENT FROM HABITABLE UNITS.**—A public housing agency may not displace a tenant from any public housing dwelling unit described in subsection (h) that is administered or operated by such agency and is habitable (including during any period of rehabilitation), unless the agency provides a suitable and comparable dwelling unit for such tenant in the same local community as such public housing dwelling unit.

(h) **COVERED PUBLIC HOUSING DWELLING UNITS.**—The public housing dwelling units described in this subsection are any such dwelling units located in any area for which major disaster or emergency was declared by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005, except that such dwelling units shall not include any public housing dwelling units operated or administered by the Housing Authority of New Orleans.

#### **SEC. 205. REPORTS ON PROPOSED CONVERSIONS OF PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS.**

Not later than the expiration of the 15-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a detailed report identifying all public housing projects located in areas impacted by Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005, for which plans exist to transfer ownership to other entities or agencies. Such report shall include the following information for each such project:

- (1) The name and location.
- (2) The number of dwelling units.
- (3) The proposed new owner.
- (4) The existing income eligibility and rent provisions.
- (5) Duration of existing affordability restrictions.
- (6) The proposed date of transfer.
- (7) Any other relevant information regarding the project.

#### **SEC. 206. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR REPAIR AND REHABILITATION.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out activities eligible for funding under the Capital Fund under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) for the repair, rehabilitation, and development of public housing of the Housing Authority of New Orleans, and for community and supportive services for the residents of public housing operated or administered by the Housing Authority of New Orleans.

#### **SEC. 207. COMPLIANCE OF EXISTING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.**

Each request for qualification or proposal issued before the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to any public housing operated or administered by the Housing Authority of New Orleans shall, notwithstanding any existing terms of such requests, be subject to and comply with all provisions of this title and, to

the extent necessary to so comply, such Housing Authority shall reissue such requests.

#### **SEC. 208. REPORTS ON COMPLIANCE.**

Not later than the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and not later than the expiration of each calendar quarter thereafter, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit a detailed report regarding compliance with the requirements of this title, including the resident participation requirement under section 203(b)(1), to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the resident councils of, and residents of public housing operated or administered by, the Housing Authority of New Orleans, and the City of New Orleans.

#### **SEC. 209. REQUIREMENTS REGARDING PUBLIC HOUSING CONSTRUCTION WORKERS.**

Any entity that receives any Federal funds made available pursuant to this title for construction, development, rehabilitation, or repair of public housing shall verify that all workers employed by such entity and engaged in such activities—

- (1) have an immigration status that allows them to legally be so employed; and
- (2) have a valid form of identification or documentation indicating such immigration status.

#### **TITLE III—DISASTER VOUCHER PROGRAM AND PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE**

##### **SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF DVP PROGRAM.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide assistance under the Disaster Voucher Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development established pursuant to Public Law 109-148 (119 Stat. 2779) through January 1, 2008, and, to the extent that amounts for such purpose are made available, such program, and the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to waive requirements under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) in administering assistance under such program, shall be so extended.

##### **SEC. 302. CLARIFICATION OF VOUCHER ALLOCATION FORMULA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007.**

In carrying out section 21033 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, to provide renewal funding for tenant-based rental housing assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for each public housing agency, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make, for any public housing agency impacted by Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, such adjustments as are appropriate to provide adequate funding to adjust for reduced voucher leasing rates and increased housing costs arising from such hurricanes.

##### **SEC. 303. PRESERVATION OF PROJECT-BASED HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTRACTS FOR DWELLING UNITS DAMAGED OR DESTROYED.**

(a) **TOLLING OF CONTRACT TERM.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a project-based housing assistance payments contract for a covered assisted multifamily housing project shall not expire or be terminated because of the damage or destruction of dwelling units in the project by Hurricane Katrina or Rita. The expiration date of the contract shall be deemed to be the later of the date specified in the contract or a date that is not less than three months after the dwelling units in the project or in a replacement project are first made habitable.

(b) **OWNER PROPOSALS FOR REUSE OR RE-SITING.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall promptly review and shall approve all feasible proposals made by owners of covered assisted multifamily housing projects submitted to the Secretary, not later than October 1, 2007, that provide for the rehabilitation of the project and the resumption of use of the assistance under the contract for the project, or,

alternatively, for the transfer, pursuant to subsection (c), of the contract or, in the case of a project with an interest reduction payments contract, of the remaining budget authority under the contract, to another multifamily housing project.

(c) **TRANSFER OF CONTRACT.**—In the case of any covered assisted multifamily housing project, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) in the case of a project with a project-based rental assistance payments contract described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (d)(2), transfer the contract to another appropriate and habitable existing project or a project to be constructed (having the same or a different owner); and

(2) in the case of a project with an interest reduction payments contract pursuant to section 236 of the National Housing Act, use the remaining budget authority under the contract for interest reduction payments to reduce financing costs with respect to dwelling units in other habitable projects not currently so assisted, and such dwelling units shall be subject to the low-income affordability restrictions applicable to projects for which such payments are made under section 236 of the National Housing Act.

A project to which a project-based rental assistance payments contract is transferred may have a different number of units or bedroom configuration than the damaged or destroyed project if approximately the same number of individuals are expected to occupy the subsidized units in the replacement project as occupied the damaged or destroyed project.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **COVERED ASSISTED MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROJECT.**—The term “assisted multifamily housing project” means a multifamily housing project that—

(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is subject to a project-based rental assistance payments contract (including pursuant to subsection (a) of this section); and

(B) that was damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita of 2005.

(2) **PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTRACT.**—The term “project-based rental assistance payments contract” includes—

(A) a contract entered into pursuant to section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(B) a contract for project rental assistance pursuant to section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q(c)(2));

(C) a contract for project rental assistance pursuant to section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); and

(D) an interest reduction payments contract pursuant to section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715e-1).

##### **SEC. 304. TENANT REPLACEMENT VOUCHERS FOR ALL LOST UNITS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008 such sums as may be necessary to provide tenant replacement vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) for the number of households that is equal to—

(1) the number of assisted dwelling units (whether occupied or unoccupied) located in covered assisted multifamily housing projects (as such term is defined in section 303(d) of this Act) that are not approved for reuse or re-siting by the Secretary; plus

(2) the number of public housing dwelling units that, as of August 28, 2005, were located in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina and were considered for purposes of allocating operating and capital assistance under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (whether occupied or unoccupied), that will not be put back into use for occupancy; plus

(3) the number of public housing dwelling units that, as of September 24, 2005, were located



in areas affected by Hurricane Rita and were considered for purposes of allocating operating and capital assistance under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (whether occupied or unoccupied), that will not be put back into use for occupancy; minus

(4) the number of previously awarded enhanced vouchers for assisted dwelling units and tenant protection vouchers for public housing units covered under this section.

Any amounts made available pursuant to this section shall, upon the request of a public housing agency for such voucher assistance, be allocated to the public housing agency based on the number of dwelling units described in paragraph (1) or (2) that are located in the jurisdiction of the public housing agency.

**SEC. 305. VOUCHER ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide 4,500 vouchers for project-based rental assistance under section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) for use in areas impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita for supportive housing dwelling units for elderly families, persons with disabilities, or homeless persons. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make available to the State of Louisiana or its designee or designees, upon request, 3,000 of such vouchers. Subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) shall not apply with respect to vouchers made available under this section.

**SEC. 306. TRANSFER OF DVP VOUCHERS TO VOUCHER PROGRAM.**

(a) TRANSFER TO SECTION 8 VOUCHER PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for tenant-based assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), such sums as may be necessary to provide vouchers for such assistance for each household that, as of the termination date of the Disaster Voucher Program referred to in section 301 of this Act, is assisted under such program, for the period that such household is eligible for such voucher assistance. Such voucher assistance shall be administered by the public housing agency having jurisdiction of the area in which such assisted family resides as of such termination date.

(b) TEMPORARY VOUCHERS.—If at any time a household for whom a voucher for rental housing assistance is provided pursuant to this section becomes ineligible for further such rental assistance—

(1) the public housing agency administering such voucher pursuant to this section may not provide rental assistance under such voucher for any other household;

(2) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recapture from such agency any remaining amounts for assistance attributable to such voucher and may not reobligate such amounts to any public housing agency; and

(3) such voucher shall not be taken into consideration for purposes of determining any future allocation of amounts for such tenant-based rental assistance for any public housing agency.

**SEC. 307. IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION OF DVP-ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS NOT ASSISTED.**

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make a good faith effort to identify all households who, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, are eligible for assistance under the Disaster Voucher Program referred to in section 301 but are not assisted under such program. Upon identification of each such household, the Secretary shall—

(1) notify such household of the rights of the household to return a public housing or other assisted dwelling unit; and

(2) to the extent that the family is eligible at such time of identification, offer the household assistance under the Disaster Voucher program.

**SEC. 308. GAO STUDY OF WRONGFUL OR ERRONEOUS TERMINATION OF FEDERAL RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of households that received Federal assistance for rental housing in connection with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita to determine if the assistance for any such households was wrongfully or erroneously terminated. The Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress not later than June 1, 2007, setting forth the results of the study, which shall include an estimate of how many households were subject to such wrongful or erroneous termination and how many of those households have incomes eligible for the household to receive tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

**TITLE IV—DAMAGES ARISING FROM FEMA ACTIONS**

**SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO REIMBURSE LANDLORDS FOR DAMAGES DUE TO FEMA MANAGEMENT OF LEASES ENTERED INTO UNDER SECTION 403 OF THE STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF ACT.**

There are authorized to be appropriated, from amounts made available before the date of the enactment of this Act under any provision of law to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for disaster relief under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief Emergency Assistance Act, such sums as may be necessary for the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide reimbursement to each landlord who entered into leases to provide emergency sheltering in response to Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma of 2005, pursuant to the program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency pursuant to section 403 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b) in the amount of actual, documented damages incurred by such landlord as a result of abrogation by such Agency of commitments entered into under such program, but not including reimbursement for any such landlord to the extent that such landlord has previously received reimbursement for such damages under any other Federal or non-Federal program.

**TITLE V—FHA SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING**

**SEC. 501. TREATMENT OF NON-CONVEYABLE PROPERTIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any property consisting of 1- to 4-family residence that is subject to a mortgage insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) and was damaged or destroyed as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Rita of 2005, if there was no failure on the part of the mortgagee or servicer to provide hazard insurance for the property or to provide flood insurance coverage for the property to the extent such coverage is required under Federal law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development—

(1) may not deny conveyance of title to the property to the Secretary and payment of the benefits of such insurance on the basis of the condition of the property or any failure to repair the property;

(2) may not reduce the amount of such insurance benefits to take into consideration any costs of repairing the property; and

(3) with respect to a property that is destroyed, condemned, demolished, or otherwise not available for conveyance of title, may pay the full benefits of such insurance to the mortgagee notwithstanding that such title is not conveyed.

(b) BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE.—Insurance claims may be paid in accordance with subsection (a) only to the extent or in such amounts as are or have been provided in advance in appropriations Acts for the costs (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661(a))) of such claims.

**TITLE VI—FAIR HOUSING ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 601. FAIR HOUSING INITIATIVES PROGRAM.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3616a), in each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009, such sums as may be necessary, but not less than \$5,000,000, for areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, of which, in each such fiscal year—

(1) 60 percent shall be available only for private enforcement initiatives for qualified private enforcement fair housing organizations authorized under subsection (b) of such section, and, of the amount made available in accordance with this paragraph, the Secretary shall set aside an amount for multi-year grants to qualified fair housing enforcement organizations;

(2) 20 percent shall be available only for activities authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) of such section; and

(3) 20 percent shall be available only for education and outreach programs authorized under subsection (d) of such section.

(b) LOW FUNDING.—If the total amount appropriated to carry out the Fair Housing Initiatives Program for either fiscal year 2008 or 2009 is less than \$50,000,000, not less than 5 percent of such total amount appropriated for such fiscal year shall be available for the areas described in subsection (a) for the activities described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such subsection.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

**TITLE VII—IMPROVED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL HURRICANE HOUSING FUNDS FOR HURRICANE RELIEF**

**SEC. 701. GAO STUDY OF IMPROVED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL HOUSING FUNDS FOR HURRICANE RELIEF.**

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to examine methods of improving the distribution of Federal housing funds to assist States covered by this Act with recovery from hurricanes, which shall include identifying and analyzing—

(1) the Federal and State agencies used in the past to disburse such funds and the strengths and weakness of existing programs;

(2) the means by and extent to which critical information relating to hurricane recovery, such as property valuations, is shared among various State and Federal agencies;

(3) program requirements that create impediments to the distribution of such funds that can be eliminated or streamlined;

(4) housing laws and regulations that have caused programs to be developed in a manner that complies with statutory requirements but fails to meet the housing objectives or needs of the States or the Federal Government;

(5) laws relating to privacy and impediments raised by housing laws to the sharing, between the Federal Government and State governments, and private industry, of critical information relating to hurricane recovery;

(6) methods of streamlining applications for and underwriting of Federal housing grant or loan programs; and

(7) how to establish more equitable Federal housing laws regarding duplication of benefits.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report describing the results of the study and any recommendations regarding the issues analyzed under the study.

**TITLE VIII—COMMENDING AMERICANS FOR THEIR REBUILDING EFFORTS**

**SEC. 801. COMMENDING AMERICANS.**

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) over 500,000 individuals in the United States have volunteered their time in helping rebuild the Gulf Coast region in the aftermath of Hurricane's Katrina and Rita;

(2) over \$3,500,000,000 in cash and in-kind donations have been made for hurricane victims;

(3) 40,000,000 pounds of food have been distributed by Catholic Charities' Food Bank through hurricane relief efforts;

(4) almost 7,000,000 hot meals have been served by Salvation Army volunteers in hurricane relief efforts;

(5) over 10,000,000 college students have devoted their spring and fall breaks to hurricane relief efforts;

(6) almost 20,000 families displaced as a result of the hurricanes have been supported by Traveler's Aid volunteers;

(7) faith-based organizations, such as Jewish Family Services, Lutheran Disaster Response, the United Methodist Committee on Relief, Presbyterian Disaster Assistance, the National Baptist Convention of America, Inc., the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the African Methodist Episcopal Church have contributed tens of thousands of man-hours for hurricane relief; and

(8) community-based organizations, such as the Boys and Girls Club of America, Junior League, Boy and Girl Scouts of America, and the YMCA, have had thousands of members volunteer with the cleanup in the Gulf States.

(b) **COMMENDATION.**—The Congress hereby commends the actions and efforts by the remarkable individuals and organizations who contributed to the hurricane relief effort and recognizes that the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast region rests on the selfless dedication of private individuals and community spirit.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 110–53.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

In section 202(d), strike paragraph (2) and insert the following new paragraph:

(2) a dwelling unit in other comparable housing located in the jurisdiction of the Housing Authority of New Orleans for which the sum of the amount required to be contributed by the tenant for rent and any separate utility costs for such unit borne by the tenant is comparable to the sum of the amount required to be contributed by the tenant for rental of a comparable public housing dwelling unit and any separate utility costs for such unit borne by the tenant.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 254, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I want to thank Mr. BARNEY FRANK, chairman of the committee, and MAXINE WATERS and other members of the Committee on Financial Services for doing such a fine job in crafting this bill.

I rise in support of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Housing Recovery Act. I truly believe this bill is a tremendous victory for the gulf coast that was affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. I once again want to commend my colleagues.

Before I start talking about my amendment, let me talk about what happened during the hurricane because I saw something during Hurricane Katrina that I have never seen in the 25 years I have been an elected official and certainly the 15 years I have been a Member of Congress. I saw something in the government that I have never seen before. I saw a government that was not just incompetent, but I saw a government that did not care about its people. I thought I was in a third world, and I have got to take a moment to commend my community because we all watched it on television and were horrified. We came together.

I represent the Jacksonville area, and we came together as a community and we sent over 16 tractor-trailers full of goods and services to New Orleans. We came together as a community. It was the business community. It was Democrats; it was Republicans. It was students, and we filled those tractor-trailers and sent them in there until the government could kick in.

What we saw was a government that was not capable of responding. Well, when you look at the top 20 positions, and one police officer told me that you don't put people in positions over disasters that have public relations backgrounds. You make them ambassadors. But you put people in to head up disasters that are life and death to your communities that have the background and experience to do the job. That certainly was not the position of FEMA or Homeland Security. I want to put that on the table before I begin.

Now, this particular amendment would allow that residents returning would have the opportunity to include their utility bill into the payment for their rent. This is something that was taking place prior to, and this would be something that would be permitted under my amendment.

Many public housing residents are being forced into deeper debt because of utility bills. Public housing residents that lived in the areas of Rita and Katrina had their monthly rent included in their utilities. Currently, their vouchers do not include utilities, and many public housing residents are forced to make tough choices.

I have three such examples. Bobby Jennings lived in C.J. Peete for 34 years prior to Katrina. She paid income-based rent in the amount of \$167 per month, which included utilities. Now she lives in another part and she

pays \$1,050 in rent which is not covered by her rent voucher, and she must pay \$429 per month out of pocket. Well, her average income, she is a senior citizen on a fixed income, is \$655 per month. So \$300 per month she has to come up with.

And that is the same for Mrs. Gloria Williams who was paying \$185 per month. Now she pays \$1,128 per month and she must come up with \$406 per month.

□ 1600

The last person is Mrs. Wright. She lived in public housing for over 20 years. She was paying the amount of \$290 per month. She is in Houston, Texas. She now pays \$625 a month, and she has to come up with an average of \$250 a month for utilities. So utilities impose a disproportionate burden for the poor. And for the average American, utility bills only comprise 6 to 10 percent of household income. In this area it is 32 to 53 percent. Those receiving vouchers have already demonstrated their great need for assistance, and they are being shortchanged. We can't allow this to continue, and we must provide proper funding to those receiving this voucher.

This amendment would ensure that utilities are part of the housing voucher for residents returning to New Orleans. The Congressional Budget Office said that it would have no direct impact as far as spending is concerned.

I urge the adoption of this amendment to help people like Mrs. Jennings, Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Wright receive the assistance they greatly deserve.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida for all the work she has done to help the residents of New Orleans and the gulf coast. I know she was down there days after the hurricane hit, and I know of her passion. I am very appreciative for the help she has given us on this legislation, and I would like to assure her that those returning residents will have included in their rent the cost of the utility bills. So please do not worry about that. It will be done.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would join my colleague in supporting this particular amendment.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Thank you.

As you said, I have been to New Orleans and the region, really, some eight times. I tell them they've got a Member-at-large in me because I feel a great passion because you saw an example of a government that did not work, but I hate to say is not working and still is not working. Eighteen months later, we have a government, and you can say it's the local government, you can say it's the State government, but I am saying the Federal

Government, shame on all of us because the people don't care why it's not working. The point is the government is not working for them.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment, but for clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. It is my understanding, and I know that your Dear Colleague letter states that currently vouchers of the public housing residents and section 8 vouchers do not include utilities. It is my understanding that prior to Katrina and Rita, the public housing residents had vouchers that did include utilities.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. That is correct. Before the hurricane, the utilities were a part of their vouchers, yes, ma'am.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So this really is just a reclarification of how it was done in the past.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. That is correct.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the bill.

The other thing that worries me, though, is just that you said you saw a government that did not care about its people. And I think certainly we have seen people in the government here that care very much; \$110 billion has been turned over to those States to use to rebuild. I just think that we all care about it, we as the government, we in the administration, and I think the State and the local government.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Let me clarify my statement.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Let me clarify my statement.

First of all, let me say that during the time of the hurricane, what I saw was a government that didn't care. It wasn't working. Everybody in the whole country, in fact, in the whole world saw that. It was a real serious indictment on the Bush administration that was in charge.

But I said since that time people have blamed the local government, the State government and the Federal Government. Yes, we have done our part, but perhaps we could have done a better job in spelling out how that money is to be used, because regardless of how much money we have appropriated, and we have appropriated and we have done a good job with that, the money has not gotten down to the people that we intended for it to get to.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Reclaiming my time, let's just say that we are moving forward. I think this bill is a way to move forward, and I would accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CORRINE BROWN OF FLORIDA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 110-53.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

In section, 202(b)(1), before "provide notice" insert: "(A)":

Before the period at the end of section 202(b)(1) insert the following: ", or (B) shall provide notice to such Housing Authority that the tenant is requesting an extension of the period to exercise such right. If, not later than August 1, 2007, a tenant provides notice requesting such an extension, as a condition of exercising a right under this paragraph to occupancy in such a dwelling unit, not later than October 1, 2007, the tenant shall provide notice to such Housing Authority of intent to exercise such right and shall identify a date that the tenant intends to occupy such a dwelling unit, which shall not be later than December 1, 2007".

At the end of section 202, add the following new subsection:

(F) ASSISTANCE IN TERMINATING EXISTING LEASES.—The Housing Authority of New Orleans shall offer to each household who provides to such Authority notice of intent in accordance with subsection exercise a right under such subsection to occupancy in a dwelling unit, and shall provide, upon the request of any such household, assistance to such household in negotiating the termination of any lease on a dwelling unit in which the household resides at the time of the household is provided a occupancy in dwelling unit under this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 254, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before I decide whether to withdraw my amendment, I have some questions for Ms. WATERS about the present status of the deadlines that are in the bill, and maybe she can clarify it for me. I have a concern that we have certain dates and deadlines in this bill. And, of course, this bill, when it passes the House, has to go to the Senate, and we have certain deadlines in that bill, and then the President has to sign it. I am concerned that when it is signed, that the residents won't have an adequate amount of time to respond.

As you well know, in the hearing that took place 18 months ago, HUD and Public Housing said of the resi-

dents that they had surveyed that they had only contacted about 25 percent. And so I want to make sure that those people are not disadvantaged and we are all on the same page. We all care about the same people.

Can you clarify for me the status of that situation?

Ms. WATERS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I know of her concern about making sure that all the residents have the opportunity to return.

In our bill we have notification for return by August 1, and they have until October to honor the August 1 notification.

Now, let me just say that we crafted this for several reasons. One is we did not want to be in the position of taking people out of where they are living now and forcing them to have to take their children out of school, but we wanted them to return in time to enroll the children in school for the semester starting in September. So we think that accomplishes that. And I know that you are concerned about all the people having adequate time.

Let me tell you something else that was taken into consideration. Mr. NEUGEBAUER, who was with us, has past experience as a developer-contractor type. He made it very clear that when you rehab a unit, that if it is not occupied by a certain length of time, then you are going to have to go back 6 months later and put the same amount of dollars in again to rehab that unit that has been sitting vacant; because of the moisture and everything in the area, that you just cannot maintain the properties without them being inhabited.

So for those two reasons, what we think makes good sense in terms of giving people an adequate period of time, and so that we don't have to spend additional money to rehab a unit the second time, we think that this would do well for those residents.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In my experience the gentlewoman, someone who is not on the committee and not from the district, has really made herself an expert and an advocate. I would say this: If as this goes forward there are delays in the legislative process, yes, of course, it would be sensible to deal with the deadlines. That is, we should think of the deadlines almost conceptually as based on a certain timeline of legislation. If the basic decisions by the government slip, then the deadline should be adjusted accordingly.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. FRANK, I have an additional question for you, then, before I withdraw

this amendment, and that pertains to the Road Home program.

Are you prepared to answer questions about that program?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Some of it I am, and some of it I am not. I am not an expert on it, but go ahead.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. My question, and it is from going down to New Orleans and talking to the residents, their concern is that, as someone said earlier, we have appropriated billions of dollars for that area. I want to know to this date how much money has been spent on the Road Home program; how much money has been expended for administrative costs; and then, what kind of fees have been attached?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I would say this, if the gentlewoman would yield to me: It is our hope, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) was very active in this, and we listened to the others, the two gentlemen from Louisiana, Mr. MELANCON and Mr. JEFFERSON, we believe we have responded to some of the issues. There was, for instance, a debate between FEMA. FEMA didn't like some aspects of the Road Home regarding whether or not you got a penalty for not staying in the State and whether or not elderly people were done. That was pulled. We have in this bill said to FEMA, please, leave that one alone. So we hope we have sped it up. No one I know of thinks that the rate of spendout of the Road Home has been sufficient to date. We hope this bill makes it better, but I don't have all the details.

Ms. WATERS. In addition to that information, we have placed in this bill a requirement that the Road Home program must report to us every 30 days, because we are watching them very closely, we have let them know that we were not happy with the progress, and now we have information coming into us that will help us to see how fast they are moving, and we will take additional action if we have to.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I have one last question on this program before I withdraw my amendment.

My understanding is if a person lives in their house and is eligible for \$50,000, that we can charge fees up to \$30,000 if that person is not coming back to the New Orleans area.

Ms. WATERS. No, I am not aware of that, Congresswoman. What I do know is this: We have up to \$150,000 in subsidy for homeowners to rebuild their homes. Some qualify for the entire amount, others qualify for different amounts based on whether or not they had insurance or whether or not there are other deductibles. My understanding is that if they decide not to come back, that they can sell their properties, and it is supposed to be at fair market value.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I am going to withdraw my amendment at this time, Mr. Chairman. I will be talking to both Chairs of the committee.

I want to let you know that I sincerely thank both of you for the leadership that you have shown in this area. And just remember, they do have a Member-at-large.

Ms. WATERS. If I may, if you will yield, I need to make one additional comment that I was just reminded of, that if they do not return to New Orleans, there is a penalty. That is designed to rebuild the neighborhoods and get people coming back. But there is a 30 percent penalty.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Thirty percent of money. In addition, my understanding is that, for example, if that person didn't have insurance, and even though the insurance told them that they were not in the area, and they have that in writing, they weren't in the flood area, they were penalized 30 percent. So that is \$30,000. So then a person could end up with \$20,000 for their home, and they cannot rebuild with that.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentlewoman would yield, there is one other aspect that was resolved. In the committee we adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) which went in the other direction and nullified one set of offsets when the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned that we had a scoring problem with CBO. There was an offset procedure for certain tax things, and frankly we felt that was not only somewhat unfair, but it was also one thing that held up the speed because we tried to offset that on the other hand.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I want to thank both of you.

I rise in support of H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Housing Recovery Act. I truly believe this bill is a tremendous victory for the Gulf Coast and those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. I commend my colleague Congressman BARNEY FRANK, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and the other Members of the Committee on Financial Services for the fine job crafting this bill.

I also rise in support of my amendment that would give Katrina public housing residents more time to return home.

Eighteen months after Hurricane Katrina, more than 4,000 families have not returned to New Orleans because most public housing remains closed. Public housing residents want to return and rebuild their city and their lives. If Congress is serious about the slogan "Bring New Orleans Back," HUD and HANO must reopen public housing and make repairs, where necessary. Everyone should be permitted to return—not just the rich.

HUD and HANO have been doing everything they can to make sure public housing residents don't return. HUD planned to demolish 5,000 units with no clear plan or timeline for bringing back these families. These public housing developments are some of the most durable housing in New Orleans. Given the solid infrastructure of these buildings and the minor damage incurred, it is clear that renovation is more cost-effective than demolition. Instead of families moving back into their affordable housing units to get back to work, and help rebuild their lives, their communities, and their city, HUD contributes to the dearth of af-

fordable housing in New Orleans, and keeps these families displaced and scattered across the country with no hope of returning.

HUD has dropped the ball on keeping contact with displaced families. At a February 22, 2007 field hearing in New Orleans for the House Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, Chairman C. Donald Babers of the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) told the subcommittee that out of 978 residents they recently tried to contact, they only made contact with about 237 residents. Mr. Babers said that they were unable to reach about 740 residents. Given that HUD and HANO only one month ago could not reach over 75 percent of the displaced public housing residents, Congress must ensure that residents do not lose the opportunity to move back to their homes simply because HANO and HUD cannot find them in a timely manner.

Residents want to come home to be closer to their families and neighbors, to return to jobs or get new jobs in the reconstruction industry. HUD reported in October 2006 that an estimated 65–70 percent of families want to return to New Orleans. Congress must give these families every chance to come home.

My amendment provides two deadlines of August 1, 2007 and October 1, 2007 for residents to declare their intent to return. The re-occupancy deadlines are October 1, 2007 and December 1, 2007. It also extends assistance to those who ask for help with early termination of leases.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment so that we can Bring New Orleans Back.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 110–53.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 308. WORK REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each individual who is 18 years of age or older and is a member of a household residing in a dwelling for which rental assistance is provided pursuant to an extension or authorization of rental assistance provided under this title shall, as a condition of the continued provision of such assistance on behalf of such household, perform not fewer than 20 hours of approved work activities (as such term is defined in section 407(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(d))) per week.

(b) EXEMPTION.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide an exemption from the applicability of paragraph (1) for any individual who—

- (1) is 62 years of age or older;
- (2) is a blind or disabled individual, as defined under section 216(i)(1) or 1614 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(i)(1); 1382c), and who is unable to comply with this section, or is a primary caretaker of such individual;

(3) is engaged in a work activity (as such term is defined in section 407(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(d)), as in effect on and after July 1, 1997);

(4) meets the requirements for being exempted from having to engage in a work activity under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or under any other welfare program of the State in which the public housing agency administering rental assistance described in subsection (a) is located, including a State-administered welfare-to-work program;

(5) is in a family receiving assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or under any other welfare program of the State in which the public housing agency administering such rental assistance is located, including a State-administered welfare-to-work program, and has not been found by the State or other administering entity to be in noncompliance with such program; or

(6) is a single custodial parent caring for a child who has not attained 6 years of age, and the individual proves that the individual has a demonstrated inability (as determined by the State) to obtain needed child care, for one or more of the following reasons:

(A) Unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance from the individual's home or work site.

(B) Unavailability or unsuitability of informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

(C) Unavailability of appropriate and affordable formal child care arrangements.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—A public housing agency providing rental assistance described in subsection (a) may administer the work activities requirement under this section directly, through a resident organization, or through a contractor having experience in administering work activities programs within the service area of the public housing agency. The Secretary may establish qualifications for such organizations and contractors.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated, from any amounts made available before the date of the enactment of this Act under any provision of law to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for disaster relief under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act relating to the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma that remain unobligated, such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 254, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1615

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to associate myself with the comments of my colleague from Texas and complimenting our chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in having a very fair and open hearing on this legislation. I often disagree with his philosophy, but I know that he is sincere in what he is trying to do, and I appreciate the fairness with which he has operated the committee and allowed these amendments come to the floor.

I also want to thank Ranking Member BACHUS for his contribution to this legislation in trying to ensure that we do the right thing in New Orleans, that things can actually be better, that we don't have to return to the way that things were.

Clearly, these hurricanes represented one of the great natural tragedies in the history of America, and so many of us had friends and family who were affected. My in-laws live in the New Orleans area. For several days, my wife didn't know if her father had survived the hurricane. It turns out he was at the convention center along with thousands of others in fairly deplorable conditions.

But my in-laws were among the lucky ones: they survived. Although their home was damaged, it has been rebuilt. But I know how this has impacted people. I have been to the gulf coast and seen the hurt, yet seen the hope as well, and hope is still alive.

But 18, 19 months later, we have to ask ourselves this question, How do we best help going forward? America has been very generous, very generous with both their public and private funds. People throughout the Fifth Congressional District of Texas opened up their arms, opened up their wallets, opened up their homes to victims of the hurricanes.

The Federal taxpayer has now contributed well over \$100 billion to this effort. Nobody can say that the American people have not been generous.

But I think we have to ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, how do we best help going forward? I do not believe that it is always an additional Federal check. We also have to make sure that a great physical tragedy of this century or this generation doesn't turn out to be a great fiscal tragedy for the next generation as well.

This amendment would try to take a modest step towards achieving those goals. It has everything to do with providing a work-related requirement that this Congress is already well acquainted with that helped revolutionize welfare reform 10 years ago, and apply it going forward to those who are recipients of the vouchers and the housing programs under this bill.

Over 10 years ago, when Congress passed Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, we began the process of ending welfare as we had known it. Instead, we replaced it in this program with a temporary assistance-based program that was based on work and self-sufficiency and responsibility and personal dignity.

Now, at the time there were countless naysayers who said this was cruel and unusual. I offered this amendment in committee. It was called un-American. They said it had no compassion. They said the program would never work, that young mothers would somehow be thrown out into the streets with starving children, that somehow they could not find a job, much less hold a job.

Mr. Chairman, the naysayers were wrong then, and the naysayers are wrong now. If you look at the record, you will see that after we passed this TANF welfare reform and created incentives for self-sufficiency, the number of families receiving cash welfare steadily declined from an all-time peak of 5.1 million families in March of 1994 to 1.9 million families in September of 2006. It represents the lowest number of people on cash public assistance rolls in over 35 years. This, I believe, is compassionate.

Child poverty has fallen and 1.6 million fewer children live in poverty today than in 1995 because of the work-related requirements that were in TANF. Child poverty has fallen dramatically, as I said. Employment of young, single mothers has doubled. Employing mothers who have never been married is up by more than 50 percent. Employment of single mothers who dropped out of high school is up by two-thirds, and we have seen unprecedented declines in poverty among children of single moms, from 50.3 percent a decade ago to 41.9 percent in 2004.

Again, the naysayers were wrong then, and the same naysayers are wrong yet again today.

Welfare reform worked 10 years ago because we cared enough to tell people, when they were facing challenges, that we were not going to allow them to give up trying. Now we have the same chance to extend this, to empower people who have been impacted by these terrible gulf coast hurricanes, some who have been stuck in public housing for 10, 15 or 20 years. We can show them that there is a better life, and it is within their reach; but the work is key to obtaining this.

So, again, my amendment is a simple one. It takes the list of approved work-related activities that have already been established over 10 years ago in welfare reform, as we know in TANF, and applies it to the recipients of this special public housing assistance that we are providing in this bill. Those recipients would be required to perform a minimum of 20 hours per week of work-related activities to help them get back on the road to self-sufficiency and move beyond public housing once and for all.

Now, the precedent for requiring recipients of public housing assistance to earn benefits is not new. In 1998, this body passed a law requiring able-bodied people living in public housing to perform 8 hours a month of community service with the notion that individuals ought to give back to their communities. My amendment would simply build on that notion and help put people back on the road to self-sufficiency. Now, I know some people will say that individuals can't find work because there are simply no jobs to be found; therefore, this amendment will not work.

But that is a false charge on two counts. First, there are clearly entry-level jobs that are still available, for

example, in New Orleans. Pick up the want ads. You will see plenty of entry-level positions that are there, and they are trying to rebuild a great city. Workers are still needed to help rebuild New Orleans. So it is false on one account.

Second of all, it is false because under the TANF requirement, no one is required to get a job if the jobs don't exist. Instead, there are 12 distinct categories of work-related activities to give individuals a broad spectrum of activities to satisfy this requirement. It includes attempting to find work, vocational education, community service and, in some instances, providing child care services to others. Again, these are all activities designed to help people begin on the road to self-sufficiency.

To ensure that only the able-bodied are affected by this requirement, my amendment exempts children, senior citizens, the disabled, those already exempt from TANF work requirements and those who cannot find appropriate or affordable child care.

Mr. Chairman, the lessons of welfare reform are very clear. By expecting more of people, you can help them expect more out of themselves. We have the opportunity to extend that, the great lessons and the great benefits of that today. We should not miss any opportunity to help break this cycle of dependency and help people change their lives for the better.

We need to help the people of the gulf coast, but we need to help the taxpayers as well. We need to ensure that the American people don't face a challenge like this going forward in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

This bill is about stabilizing families who have been displaced because of a natural disaster. These are people who are trying to return home. The people that he is referring to are people who come from various walks of life. Some of them do work, even though they live in public housing. Some of them are on fixed income, some are elderly, some are disabled and some of them are in welfare programs already.

This amendment is not needed. It is not proper. It is not the time that should be utilized to try and do something that really has already been taken care of in welfare reform. We should be about the business of returning people to their homes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, may I just inquire of the gentleman from Texas whether or not there is data available that would suggest the need

for this amendment. I don't like to just oppose amendments just because. Is there data available that would suggest a need for this?

Mr. HENSARLING. Does the gentleman yield time?

Mr. CLEAVER. Yes.

Mr. HENSARLING. I am not sure what data you would be looking for. I believe it's a very important principle. The data that I have seen is the data that I have cited on the benefits of applying a work-related requirement to an income-based program.

Mr. CLEAVER. I am talking about New Orleans and Mississippi.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I would apply the statistics in the data that I have seen from the improvements in TANF to this program.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you. The problem with that, and I appreciate your interest in this issue, and I am sure you probably are not aware of the fact that in New Orleans there are 36,000 participants in TANF. All but 5,000 are children; all but 5,000 are children. This legislation is saying we want children to volunteer 20 hours a week in order to receive assistance.

In addition to that, we are spending about \$5 billion a week in Iraq, and we are building housing, but we are not requiring Iraqis to volunteer in order to be the recipients of the largesse of the American taxpayers.

The assumption here is that the people don't need to work and so they somehow have to be coerced into working. As a former resident of public housing, there is a new issue arising, and that is that many of the people in public housing are elderly.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished lady from California and our chairman, Mr. FRANK, for doing an excellent job in leading us.

This amendment represents the ugly side of this Nation. This amendment is cruel, it is cold, it is calculating, and it is pandering to the schizophrenic dichotomy that has plagued this Nation since they first brought Africans on these shores from Africa, and that is the issue of race and poverty.

Let me tell you something, gentleman. Where were you? Where was your amendment when the Twin Towers were hit and people of New York suffered that catastrophe? There was no cry before we give them help, they have got to go get a job. Everybody was there and poured in help, as they should, the American way.

Where was your amendment down in Florida when the hurricanes hit down there? Nobody said, make them work before we help them.

Where were you last month when the hurricanes hit in Arkansas and then south Georgia, when the President went down and declared a disaster area? We helped those people.

My friend, let me remind you of something. I am going to tell you this

story. It's a story about some folks that went down the road to Jericho, and this gentleman fell among thieves. He had disaster. He was hurting, and he was pained. Somebody walked by him and said nothing and did nothing. Another person walked by him and did nothing.

Your amendment is worse. You want to kick them and say get up and get a job. But that third man had compassion on him, and in his hour of need, picked him up, put him on his horse, took him to an inn and paid him to take care of him and house him.

That is what this amendment is doing. It is a Good Samaritan amendment. Yours is the Ugly American amendment, and it needs to be defeated.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

□ 1630

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members who have spoken before me, and I am greatly concerned about the amendment. I am concerned because I, too, understand what happened with 9/11. It was one of the great disasters of our time, and yet I know of no amendments comparable to this one.

My friend from Texas and I in committee engaged in somewhat of a Q and A, so I believe it appropriate and fair that he and I do a similar thing at this time. So to my friend from Texas I ask, what amendment would you have imposed on the more than \$15 billion that the families received after 9/11? Which, by the way, I think was appropriate.

I ask my friend to respond, and I yield him such time as he may need within my 2 minutes to do so.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, to help answer the question of the gentleman from Georgia, I wasn't in Congress, so therefore I had no amendment to offer.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Because my time is limited, let me just ask, if you would, what would you have done, is my question.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, as typical, what I would try to do is offer offsets. And I believe that any income-based program of cash assistance or other welfare assistance ought to be tied to a self-sufficiency requirement.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I have limited time. Would you have required work for the families of 9/11?

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, I believe that anybody who is receiving income-based assistance from the Federal Government ultimately ought to be on the road to self-sufficiency. As I understand it, some of that—

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have left on this amendment.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to yield 1 additional minute to Representative CLEAVER.

Mr. CLEAVER. The point I was trying to make earlier was that, actually, the fact that this is not a welfare reform bill, this is about aiding people in a distressed area.

If we are talking about TANF recipients, it is important to understand that in the State of Louisiana, 5,000 TANF recipients are adults, and the bulk of them are children. In Mississippi, 8 percent of them are adults, and the rest of the 32,270 are children. And I think that we have gone awry converting a bill aimed at providing relief for people who are hurting down in the deepest parts of who they are and trying to impose a welfare rights bill on them when we have not done it in any other crisis in the history of this Republic. It is not the right thing to do to say to people that, in the midst of your struggle, in the midst of you trying to rebuild your home, rekindle your belief in the Nation, that we are going to now require that you volunteer.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing on this opposition, I would simply like to say, I think that my colleagues have made a wonderful case for why we should not support this amendment.

And let me just say that this amendment is not in the spirit of the work that has been done on this bill. We have had wonderful cooperation with Ranking Member BACHUS, Ranking Member of the subcommittee BIGGERT, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER, who all attended the hearing and participated in the tours. And I think that everybody is bending over backwards to do the right thing.

We are not trying to penalize people, we are not trying to accuse people of trying to get something for nothing, we are not trying to treat people differently than we treat others. And I think this has been demonstrated throughout our work.

So the case that has been made here and the comparisons that have been made are legitimate. And I think you can see very clearly that there is some very deep feelings about any attempt to treat people differently, to try and penalize them in any unfair way, to try and put another welfare reform bill on top of the welfare reform bill that we already have that people are involved in. And I think that my colleagues in this Congress, too, will understand that.

I suppose I could always say to the gentleman, in the interest of us working together, perhaps you should withdraw the amendment, but that is not mine to say. Mine simply is to say that I am opposed to the amendment. I think it is disruptive, I think that it is polarizing, and I think it is not the kind of amendment we would like to

see on a bill where we have had such tremendous cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, again, this is a very, very simple amendment. I have no idea what is so cruel and unusual about people having the opportunity to become self-reliant, to earn paychecks instead of welfare checks.

The gentleman from Georgia, who spoke with great stridency, I don't question his sincerity; I do question a number of his policies. I have no doubt that the gentleman has voted against tax relief to help create 7½ million jobs turning welfare checks to paychecks.

So the gentleman has different ways of trying to help people. I look at the statistics. What has helped people? What has brought down child poverty rates? What has helped single mothers find self-sufficiency?

So I don't understand, after 18 months, after \$100 billion of taxpayer money, why it is so bad to say people ought to be on the road to self-sufficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 110-53.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mrs. BIGGERT:

In section 203(a), strike "(including any uninhabitable unit and any unit previously approved for demolition)" and insert "that was occupied as of August 25, 2005,".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 254, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce an amendment that I think fixes a provision of the bill that mistakenly includes replacements for 2,000 units in New Orleans, even though these units were not occupied and, in fact, were condemned and scheduled for demolition prior to Katrina.

Let's just do the math. Before Katrina, there were 5,156 public housing units that were occupied in New Orleans. We don't know how many of those 5,156 residents will want to return. We have asked HUD to find them and conduct a survey to ask that question. In the meantime, this bill author-

izes replacements not only for the 5,156 units that were occupied by Katrina, it throws in another 2,000 units that were unoccupied, condemned, and scheduled for demolition. I see no point to that.

We don't know how many of the residents will return. Why then would we want to replace not only the 5,156 units they occupied, but an additional 2,000 units that nobody lived in even both before Katrina?

My amendment will permit one-for-one replacement of the units that were occupied by public housing residents at the time of the 2005 storms.

According to CBO estimates, this amendment would reduce the spending authorized in this bill by \$270 million, which is the cost of replacing the 2,000 public housing units that nobody lived in before the 2005 storms hit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

First let me thank Mrs. BIGGERT for all the work that she has done in helping us to get this bill to the floor, and the time that she has taken to pay attention to this issue. And I certainly respect her thinking on this issue and the fact that she was there, she went through the units, she saw them. But I must respectfully disagree.

I must disagree because not only did we have 18,000 individuals on the waiting lists, waiting for public housing units; yes, these units were boarded up, these units were boarded up, and there had been a promise that there would be redevelopment that had not taken place. Not only do you have 18,000 on the waiting list, do you realize that many of the people that have been displaced because of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita are folks who were working, who had jobs? They lost their homes, they lost their jobs. They are living in temporary situations. They are in Houston, they are in Atlanta, they are in cities in Florida. They are all over. They now may qualify for public housing based on the fact that they have lost on their jobs. They want to return, they want to come back, and they should have an opportunity to apply for and receive public housing units that should be available to them.

So let me just say that we should have one-for-one replacement because it is needed. People are standing in line. They were standing in line before Katrina; they will be standing in line after Katrina. And, Mrs. BIGGERT, if you remember, the mayor of the city of New Orleans said he would love to contract for 1,000 units to have places for people who want to come back to New Orleans to work.

We are unleashing the possibilities for infrastructure rebuilding, with



some of the match requirements having been modified in the way that we have done them. They want to get started with the building. And people need places to live. So he would like to have units for people to come back and work in. When these units are replaced, we have enough people who want to live in them. And so it is not a fair way to determine how many units get replaced by simply saying only those that were occupied prior to Katrina, because that waiting list is a reminder to all of us of how badly those units are needed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we saw down there was we saw some housing units and some of the public housing that had been refurbished and was ready to rent. But what we did see in those housing projects was a lot of vacant units. So one of the things that is going on right now, the dynamics as we are talking about earlier about getting something going there, is a couple of organizations have come in, and they have some master-planned communities to go back and replace some of this housing.

You almost cannot describe on this House floor, we really need pictures to be able to articulate the condition of some of this housing. It is throwing good money after bad to go back and bring very many of these units back because, one, they have been sitting for 18 months just the way they were the night that the folks that left those units left them. They have been under water. They have been vandalized.

So one of the things that we need to do is we need to provide a certain amount of housing that meets the current demand, see how many people actually want to come back to New Orleans, come back to those neighborhoods. I would submit to you that if you want folks to come back, and I think that is the goal of the people of New Orleans, they want people to come back to the community, if you want them to come back, don't ask them to come back to those units that were in terrible condition before the hurricane and would cost a lot of money to restore. We should take those new dollars and provide a new opportunity for the people in New Orleans, and not mandate things that would cause the resources to be diverted to spending a lot of money.

And I would tell you, in some cases, as the gentlewoman Ms. WATERS mentioned, I have been a home builder and a land developer, I know what the cost of restoration is, and many times the cost of restoration of units exceeds the cost of creating those new units.

But putting those arguments aside, just going back and recreating what was already a bad thing, as Ranking

Member BACHUS said before, in some of these where we had a high concentration of poor people is not good policy.

So the Biggert amendment makes sense. Let's let the demand drive it. As there is demand to fix up these units. If the new units are not ready, there are ways to meet those market demands.

□ 1645

But if you go back and ask them to come up with a number, and let's say that is two or 3,000 units or whatever that number is, and those units sit vacant because people don't want to go back to those neighborhoods, we have defeated the purpose and, unfortunately, not been good stewards of the American taxpayers' money. So I would urge Members to support the Biggert amendment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) 3 minutes.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with some interest to the comments on this amendment, and I think there would be substantially more credibility for the people who are advancing it if there had actually been some units constructed or even started in the 17 or 18 months since Hurricane Katrina occurred.

It is somewhat amazing to me how we have fought for so many years to do community development, and all of a sudden HUD and our colleagues here want to do community development, but they want to do it in this distress atmosphere where there is no housing, even for people to move back into who would participate and do work on the units.

Here is what has happened. The hospitals that had damage to the first floors went back in and put patients on the second, third and fourth floors. The housing, the public housing that had damage to the first floors, the Public Housing Agency, which, by the way, is in receivership under HUD, not an independent local housing authority, but in receivership, being operated by HUD, took the position that it would be unsafe to put public housing tenants back in those units by restoring second, third, fourth floors of the housing units.

Now, I can't figure out how it is safe to put medical patients on the second, third and fourth floors of hospitals where you have gone in and basically done some remedial stuff on the first floors of the hospitals, and yet it is unsafe to put people who have no housing to return to on the second, third, fourth floors, and restore the first floors of the public housing.

This is not an argument against doing longer-term community revitalization. That needs to happen, and we are supportive of that. But in this distress situation, there needs to be, first, restoration of the housing that was there so that people can move back in and get back into their communities and stop being scattered all over the country. And that should be the high-

est priority that we are pursuing, and that is what the bill does.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I would like to reiterate something that the gentleman from North Carolina just said, and that is the fact that we are not trying to stop development. As a matter of fact, what we are doing is restoring units so that people can have some place to return. Their lives are in a temporary state of existence. Our residents that we talked to said they would be happy to work with the housing authority and HUD to talk about the future development. So I just wanted to make that clear.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I just want to clarify about using the multi-stories. Most of the housing that we saw, and I am not going to say all of it, we didn't see all of the housing, but most of the housing is one- and two-story. There may have been some three-story. And some of those are walkups; in other words, the second story is a part of the first part of the unit; in other words, it is a two-story unit. So the argument that you are dealing with a high rise where there is floor 3 up to 10 is usable, in these particular housing units that we saw there was not multistory housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from Illinois has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that Mr. NEUGEBAUER clarified that. The buildings, we went into those buildings and we climbed up to the second floor and it was just as bad as the first floor and there were no other floors.

One thing about New Orleans housing is at least it was not the high rises like we saw originally in Chicago, that a whole precinct would be public housing. And those have been done away with.

But let me just say that we want people to come back, and we want them to have the housing. And there are some of the units that have been fixed up. And what has happened is there is nobody there, and the police have to come because they are broken into and they are vandalized. And we need more people there.

But these units, we need to know how many people are going to come back originally. We have got to start the process someplace, and we don't seem to be able to do that. If we have 5,156 residents that were promised that they could come back, we should provide that. And it is a one-on-one. But for the 2,000, let's get those first people back and get them back by August so that they could have their kids go to school. The housing is not great, but let's get them back to do that. But to have 2,000 other units that are built

that we really would rather get the first ones going, we have got the money for it. And I think now we are talking about 18,000 people that are on the waiting list.

First of all, let's just say that there are people that have moved to other States. They have jobs. They have a life. The survey goes out, and it is going to be completed by HUD and we will know. We don't know how many people are on the waiting list. Nobody has made an attempt to figure out if they are people that are waiting or they have gone someplace else.

So I would say that this is just to get it going. And to undertake 5,165 units is going to take awhile. Obviously, to build a whole multi-use facility is going to take a lot more time. But there are plans to do it. So we can do it both, but let's get it going.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has the right to close.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, in that case, since I am our last speaker, I would ask the other side to use up their time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, with that, again, before we make all these decisions, we really have to know how many people are going to return. If we have the 5,100-some units and all the people that have been living in those units don't return, then there will be a time that they can open up the section 8 housing and have people off the waiting list who qualify. If they still qualify, if they come back.

But what this bill is doing is a one-on-one replacement, and that is what it says in this bill, is to replace the one-on-one replacement for those units that we were talking about, whether it is 5,000 or it is 7,000. And I say let's use the dollars that we have to start with the people that were displaced from there. They have the public housing, they have the vouchers, and let's not wait any longer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to Mr. BACHUS for the remaining time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, in my earlier statement I said that the one-for-one replacement is not the best way to rebuild public housing in New Orleans. In fact, it is not only not the best way, it is the wrong way, because what we are doing here is we are saying before we replace these units, before we tear them down and build a community like Centennial, or East Lake, we are going to renovate the existing structures with taxpayers' money. What that does, oh, yes, it may get people back, but it gets them back into the same failed system.

They are out there. They have homes now. Let's continue to give them

vouchers, let them stay, and then when we build a community that is safe, that they can be proud of, that is mixed-use, then we bring them back.

I mentioned East Lake. And East Lake was, as I said earlier, was the highest crime area in the entire State of Georgia. Today it is the 11th safest precinct out of 56.

One thing I didn't tell you about East Lake, the school in East Lake, prior to this development, only 31 percent of the children in that school were performing up to the State standardized testing. Today, two-thirds are, and they say within 2 years they will be at three-fourths. That is as good as any school in just about any school in Atlanta.

The director of the East Lake Community Foundation, Carol Naughton, said, while East Lake did not provide one-to-one replacement, it actually ends up serving more low-income families than are served under the previous arrangement. The occupancy rate at the old East Lake was 67 percent. Today it is 93 percent, and for subsidized homes it is 100 percent.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois is absolutely irrelevant to whether or not people ought to be occupying existing units. That is not what is involved here.

First of all, let me say the gentleman from Alabama and others said they have these plans to build these great new places. Who is stopping them? The hurricane was in September of 2005. It is now March of 2007. Have they started this? Have I stopped them? Have the tenants stopped them? Has the gentlewoman from California stopped them? Nobody has stopped them.

And the New Orleans Housing Authority, by the way, is HUD in drag. So nobody here has prevented them.

Here is what we are saying. What is amended is this: if you plan to tear down units that are now habitable, you cannot do that until you have met with the tenants, talked about this and replaced them.

This is an issue not about whether you live in the existing units. This isn't about rehabbing existing units. This is as to what is the obligation to replace the units.

The fact is that, according to HUD's own figures, more than half of the rental units in New Orleans were destroyed by the hurricane. People talk about job problems. That is because they have nowhere to live.

The gentlewoman's amendment would reduce by 2,000 the number of units they would be obligated to build before tearing down things that now exist. And you know, it is very nice. We have been doing this for years. We have promised the poor people all kinds of things, and those promises don't always materialize.

All we are saying is do whatever destruction you want after you have found places to live. And let me make it clear: we are talking about people who don't live here, who live in Texas and elsewhere and they want to come back. And it is not simply former residents of public housing. There were a lot of people who were displaced from New Orleans. We don't think we are in danger of running out of people who want to come back.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to be clear that the reason the units haven't been replaced there is because, as the gentleman knows, there has been some historical preservation issues.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. That is simply not the case. Here is the problem with the gentleman's view. They have this view that you can only build new units for poor people after you have torn down what they had. No one has enjoined them from building new units, except the budget that the people on the other side have voted for. We have got to get this clear. Nobody has prevented, there have been no plans by HUD, also known as the Housing Authority of New Orleans, to build new units. Nobody has stopped them except, yes, people have said you can't tear down what we have as the pre-condition for building. But if HUD had wanted to go forward and build, no one would have prevented that. The wonderful housing that the gentleman from Alabama talked about, the mixed-use housing, what has stopped them from building it? I will tell what you has stopped them from building it, the budgets that have been voted for by my friends on the other side that didn't have any money for new housing construction.

□ 1700

I will tell you what we are going to do. We are going to pass the GSE bill that is going to have the housing affordability fund so they can build these things.

So we are simply saying do not destruct before you replace and do the poor people the favor of tearing down the bad housing they live in so they have nothing left at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN  
OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BLUMENAUER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 110-53.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FEMA HOUSING ASSISTANCE**

**SEC. 901. EXTENSION OF FEMA HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide until December 31, 2007, temporary housing assistance, including financial and direct assistance, under section 408(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(1)) to individuals and households eligible to receive such assistance as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, and to the extent that amounts for such purpose are made available, such assistance shall be so extended.

**SEC. 902. VOUCHER ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FEMA RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSEHOLDS RESIDING IN FEMA TRAILERS.**

(a) TRANSFER OF FEMA RENTAL ASSISTANCE TO SECTION 8 VOUCHER PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), such sums as may be necessary to provide vouchers for such assistance for each individual and household that is eligible for such voucher assistance and received financial assistance for temporary housing under section 408(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(1)) as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, for the period beginning upon termination of such temporary housing assistance and continuing through such period that such individual or household remains eligible for such voucher assistance. Such voucher assistance shall be administered by the public housing agency having jurisdiction of the area in which such assisted individual or household resides as of such termination date.

(b) VOUCHER ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS RESIDING IN FEMA TRAILERS.—

(1) OFFER.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall offer, to each individual and household who, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, receives direct assistance for temporary housing under section 408(c)(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(2)) as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma and is eligible for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), a voucher for such rental assistance, subject to the availability of amounts for such assistance made available in advance in appropriation Acts.

(2) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), such sums as may be necessary to provide vouchers for such assistance for each individual and household that, pursuant to an offer of such assistance under paragraph (1) requests such assistance, for the period beginning upon occupancy of the individual or household in a dwelling unit acquired for rental with such assistance and continuing through such period that such in-

dividual or household remains eligible for such voucher assistance.

(c) TEMPORARY VOUCHERS.—If at any time an assisted family for whom a voucher for rental housing assistance is provided pursuant to this section becomes ineligible for further such rental assistance—

(1) the public housing agency administering such voucher pursuant to this section may not provide rental assistance under such voucher for any other household;

(2) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recapture from such agency any remaining amounts for assistance attributable to such voucher and may not re-obligate such amounts to any public housing agency; and

(3) such voucher shall not be taken into consideration for purposes of determining any future allocation of amounts for such tenant-based rental assistance for any public housing agency.

**SEC. 903. REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT VOUCHERS.**

No owner (as such term is defined in section 8(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(f)) of any dwelling unit for which, at any time, rental payments for the individual or household residing in the unit were made, in whole or in part, using financial assistance for temporary housing provided under section 408(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(1)) as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, may refuse to lease such dwelling unit to a family on whose behalf tenant-based rental assistance is made available under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), a proximate cause of which is the status of such family as a holder of such voucher.

AMENDMENT NO. 5, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, because I have a modified amendment at the desk, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 5 be modified.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

**TITLE IX—PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FEMA HOUSING ASSISTANCE**

**SEC. 901. EXTENSION OF FEMA HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide until December 31, 2007, temporary housing assistance, including financial and direct assistance, under section 408(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(1)) to individuals and households eligible to receive such assistance as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, and to the extent that amounts for such purpose are made available, such assistance shall be so extended.

**SEC. 902. VOUCHER ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FEMA RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSEHOLDS RESIDING IN FEMA TRAILERS.**

(a) TRANSFER OF FEMA RENTAL ASSISTANCE TO SECTION 8 VOUCHER PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), such sums as may be necessary to provide vouchers for such assistance for each individual and household that

is eligible for such voucher assistance and received financial assistance for temporary housing under section 408(c)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(1)) as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma, for the period beginning upon termination of such temporary housing assistance and continuing through such period that such individual or household remains eligible for such voucher assistance. Such voucher assistance shall be administered by the public housing agency having jurisdiction of the area in which such assisted individual or household resides as of such termination date.

(b) VOUCHER ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS RESIDING IN FEMA TRAILERS.—

(1) OFFER.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall offer, to each individual and household who, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, receives direct assistance for temporary housing under section 408(c)(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(c)(2)) as a result of Hurricane Katrina, Rita, or Wilma and is eligible for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), a voucher for such rental assistance, subject to the availability of amounts for such assistance made available in advance in appropriation Acts.

(2) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), such sums as may be necessary to provide vouchers for such assistance for each individual and household that, pursuant to an offer of such assistance under paragraph (1) requests such assistance, for the period beginning upon occupancy of the individual or household in a dwelling unit acquired for rental with such assistance and continuing through such period that such individual or household remains eligible for such voucher assistance.

(c) TEMPORARY VOUCHERS.—If at any time an assisted family for whom a voucher for rental housing assistance is provided pursuant to this section becomes ineligible for further such rental assistance—

(1) the public housing agency administering such voucher pursuant to this section may not provide rental assistance under such voucher for any other household;

(2) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recapture from such agency any remaining amounts for assistance attributable to such voucher and may not re-obligate such amounts to any public housing agency; and

(3) such voucher shall not be taken into consideration for purposes of determining any future allocation of amounts for such tenant-based rental assistance for any public housing agency.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 254, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, please permit me to take just a moment to thank the chairperson of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK. I am so honored to have the opportunity to serve under his leadership. There are many persons who are great managers. Great managers are concerned about doing things right, but I want you to know that our leader is concerned about doing the right thing, and I am honored that he is the chairperson of our committee.

I also want to thank the subcommittee chairperson Chairwoman WATERS. She has gone to Louisiana on many occasions, and Mississippi. She has held one hearing there where she was Chair, and she attended another hearing wherein she was a ranking member. And in attending these hearings, she did more than sit in a physical location and listen to people talk. She actually went to the housing complexes. She actually talked to persons who were living in the apartments, the units, and in so doing, she gained a greater understanding of what is actually taking place in the lives of the people who have been displaced. So I thank her for all that she has done.

I also thank the Members of the minority who attended. I am greatly appreciative that they were there and showed great interest in what was happening to the people from Louisiana who have moved to other locations as well as those who are trying to move back.

And finally I thank the staff. The staff has done an outstanding job in helping us to put this legislation together. They are to be commended. We do a lot of things, but we do most of them because we have good staff, and I thank them.

Mr. Chairman, Hurricane Katrina, one of the greatest natural disasters of our time, has caused us to confront one of the greatest domestic issues of our time. And the question that we have to confront is how does the richest country in the world treat the poorest victims of one of the world's greatest disasters?

The richest country in the world, the country where 1 out of every 110 persons is a millionaire, how does it treat persons who are among the least, the last, and the lost who have suffered as a result of a natural disaster? With all due respect given to my chairman, I don't want to get into the war, but a country wherein \$177 million is being spent not per year, not per month, not per week, but per day on the war, how does this country, the richest in the world, treat the least, the last, and the lost when they have suffered a natural disaster?

I am proud to say that our response to Hurricane Katrina has taught me that in times of disaster, Americans of goodwill want to see that no American, to borrow a cliché, is left behind. Communities across the length and breadth of this country opened their arms, their homes, their hearts to the

Katrina survivors. From financial services institutions to nonprofits, from apartment owners to homeowners, we answered the clarion call for help, understanding in a sacred sense that but for the grace of God there go I.

However, I also understand and I have learned in a secular sense that HUD, not FEMA, is best suited to meet the mid- to long-term needs of disaster victims. In fact, a White House report from February of 2006, styled "Lessons Learned" indicates that HUD was mistakenly not engaged in the housing response until late in the effort. It also indicates that HUD has expertise in providing the long-term housing needs that these victims so desperately need. It further indicates and recommends that HUD be designated the lead Federal agency for providing temporary housing.

FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, by definition should not, should not manage long-term housing needs. Today, more than 18 months after Katrina, more than 120,000 households are still receiving FEMA assistance. More than 37,000 households are still receiving FEMA rental assistance. It is past time, Mr. Chairman, to get the Federal Emergency Management Agency out of the Katrina long-term housing crisis, and it is time that we put the Housing and Urban Development program in charge.

Why is there a long-term Katrina housing crisis? Because the vast majority of all families receiving FEMA rental assistance have extremely low incomes and are disabled and/or elderly.

Why is there a long-term Katrina rental housing crisis? Because of the Katrina survivors receiving rental assistance, 7 in 10 households have annual incomes below \$15,000 per year, because more than half of the monthly incomes are \$750 or less, because more than 44 percent have health care problems that will impact their abilities to work.

How has FEMA responded to this housing crisis? By moving real people with real problems from one deadline to another deadline. The section 403 rental program alone speaks volumes. The deadline for section 403 moved from March 1, 2006, to March 30, 2006, to May 31, 2006, to June 30, 2006, to July 31, 2006, to August 30, 2006.

It is time to end the deadlines and extend a lifeline to only those who are eligible for HUD assistance.

This amendment, I believe my friends on the other side should really love this amendment because it provides assistance to the people that don't have a place to return home to, and I think that is what my friends are indicating we should do. This amendment extends section 408 rental housing assistance until the end of this year. Further, it would help the families who are eligible for section 8 rental vouchers to get section 8 rental vouchers. And as soon as a family becomes ineligible for section 8 rental vouchers,

then the family would cease to get the vouchers, and the vouchers would cease to exist.

This amendment also allows persons living in FEMA trailers who are eligible to receive section 8 vouchers to receive section 8 rental vouchers. Again, they must be eligible to receive the vouchers to, in fact, acquire the section 8 vouchers.

This amendment is supported by over 50 not-for-profits and other agencies. It has a zero direct impact on spending. It has a budget score of zero. And I think it is time for us to end the deadline, extend the timeline, and extend long-term rental assistance only to those persons who are eligible to receive it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would again extend FEMA temporary financial assistance through the end of December and then provide those section 8 vouchers to FEMA-assisted families when FEMA assistance expires, and that is exactly what the gentleman was talking about, but I think that the amendment is unnecessary.

The President currently has the authority to extend the length of this temporary assistance, as he has already done before. This assistance was supposed to expire at the end of 18 months, but the President extended it through August of 2007 to allow FEMA ample time, I think, to work with the families and help them secure permanent housing. This means that this assistance will have lasted a full 2 years since Katrina.

Since the hurricanes, FEMA has provided billions of dollars in assistance directly to individuals and households to support their recovery, including flood insurance payouts, direct payments for rental assistance, payments for home repairs and lost property. But FEMA assistance was supposed to be temporary to give families that were affected by the devastation time to get back on their feet. But today, as was said, 35,000 families are still living in FEMA trailers. Our efforts should be focused on moving these families to permanent housing, including homeownership, instead of keeping them in limbo.

It really concerns me that we move from FEMA and then turn it into section 8 housing. Deadlines such as the August 2007 deadline have encouraged families to make decisions about their future rather than continuing the expectation that the Federal Government will provide for them. In fact, every time FEMA has had a deadline and has enforced it, we have seen more people move further on the road to recovery and self-sufficiency. When FEMA moved people out of the hotels and motels, people said thousands would be

homeless. In fact, nationwide less than 100 people were in the shelters as a result, and most of them for only 3 days. I understand the same held true for the cruise ships. When the cruise ships' assistance ended, nobody ended up in a shelter.

So we need to encourage the President to have the flexibility he needs to do this right, and that means leaving it to the administration to determine when and for how long to extend the housing aid through FEMA.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, apparently it is understood, I suppose, that moving is not a pleasant thing, and in contemplation of moving, many persons become distraught. I personally don't like moving, and I suspect that many of my friends on the other side do not.

My point is it creates a lot of stress in the lives of people to move from deadline to deadline. This amendment extends a lifeline and gives them the time to adjust their lives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, thank the chairman of the full committee Mr. FRANK, and the chairwoman of the subcommittee Ms. WATERS, and then my colleague from Texas Mr. GREEN, who eloquently laid out for us the reason for this particular amendment.

Might I say, having not listened to all of his statement, I know that one of the elements of his offering of this amendment is firsthand personal experience, because I walked with him through the cots of the Reliance Center on a regular basis, over and over again. I was on the telephone as the buses started leaving the convention center and leaving the Superdome coming into Houston in the middle of the night.

We have seen the actual results of massive, long-term evacuation. It is well-known that FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security were not prepared for long-term evacuation.

This is an amendment that extends the deadline to December 31, 2007, for several reasons. First of all, might I say that it might have been the executive branch that extended it, but it really was the Director of FEMA being pounded upon, and I must say Director Paulison, the newer Director of FEMA, is very sensitive and concerned about this issue. He is putting his nose to the grindstone, along with, of course, the White House that has said to him you can do that. But each time these deadlines come, they are disruptive.

I went to a set of apartments, to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, in apartments where evacuees were holding eviction notices because they are coming up against each time a set of deadlines with nobody seeming to be able to respond. The reason why the thousands of people did not go out on the street is because the good citizens of Houston, Salt Lake City, Atlanta or Los Angeles, the nonprofits stood up to the case. In Houston today, we have people meeting every week, nonprofits, led by the United Way, trying to prepare for the inevitable, which is people out on the street.

This amendment gives several things an opportunity to happen. One, first of all, let me celebrate this bill because it gives section 8 vouchers over and beyond the ones that should be assigned to the city of Houston for Houstonians. That has been a conflict. "I need a section 8 voucher. I live in Houston. Why are you overlooking me?"

Now we have a pathway so that we recognize that we have failed in our long-term evacuation. My friends, accept it. You have done a horrible job. This is a long-term evacuation that we had no solutions to.

Particularly I want to thank the author of this amendment and this bill, because now you also give an opportunity for us to go back into public housing. Just using Houston as an example, the predominant number of those who came to Houston were out of the city center there, the civic center, and, of course, the Superdome. They were the people displaced out of the housing projects. Isn't it ridiculous that they want to go back to their city and that we are blocking them from getting into their housing projects?

So these section 8 vouchers that will come about in this bill will be helpful while they are trying to get home. This extension that Mr. GREEN is offering will help them while they are trying to get home.

You go to these individuals. Some of them have made a commitment to live in Houston. I guess they made a commitment to live in Atlanta, maybe in New York. But many of them you talk to say, I just want to get home. But they are being blocked by this administration in not being able to get in their public housing, and they are coming up against one deadline after another.

You can't get yourself together. We have the elderly and disabled. We don't know if they will ever be able to go back, but they certainly need these resources being offered by Mr. GREEN in this amendment.

I enthusiastically support this concept of an extension to December 31, 2007, Mr. Chairman, and I support the voucher projects of this bill. I ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

When FEMA's temporary housing programs expire on August 31, 2007, over 120,000 families housed across the country through FEMA-funded trailers, mobile homes and rental assistance could be displaced a second time.

Housing assistance is critical for the many low-income, elderly, and disabled evacuees

displaced by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. An estimated 35,000 families currently receive Section 408 rental assistance from FEMA; the vast majority of these families reside in Houston. The average income of surviving families now in subsidized Houston apartments was less than \$20,000 in Louisiana. While more than 60 percent of families were employed before Katrina, less than 20 percent are currently employed.

Families continue to face numerous challenges while rebuilding their lives in new communities, including finding affordable housing, health care, child care, and employment. The scarcity of housing in the Gulf Coast disproportionately hurts lower-income households, making it difficult for evacuees to find affordable housing and reducing the likelihood of their return home. Of the units destroyed or damaged by the hurricanes, 71 percent were affordable to low-income families and 30 percent were affordable to very low-income families.

This amendment would extend FEMA housing assistance until December 31, 2007, and then transfer income-eligible households to HUD's tenant-based rental assistance program when FEMA assistance ends, so that displaced families will have a place to stay while they wait for housing in the Gulf Coast to be rebuilt. Tenant-based vouchers would also be available to households currently living in FEMA trailers and mobile homes. This is important because conditions in many trailers are deteriorating and deadlines in many local communities for trailers and mobile homes are rapidly approaching. This amendment puts into law the deadline that I have worked on through negotiations and letters to FEMA.

The vouchers in this amendment would be "temporary" in the sense that they would only be available through the duration of the households' eligibility. Finally, this amendment would require property owners currently receiving rental assistance for displaced households to accept Section 8 vouchers for displaced households. HUD's role in meeting the longer-term housing needs of people displaced by disasters is supported by many members of Congress, housing advocates, and the Bush Administration. Nothing in this amendment would deny Houstonians their right to Section 8 vouchers.

I urge you to vote "yes" for the Green amendment so that we can provide displaced families with the assurance and stability they need to continue their recovery.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are all working in the same direction here. We are all trying to figure out what is the best avenue to restore life for the people that were affected by this hurricane, and I think what we are bringing to this floor today in a meaningful debate is what is the best way to do that.

Some have talked about different methodologies about being able to restore these communities in the best way. But one of the things we have to have in our country in almost every life is structure.

April 15 is upon us, and that is the day our income tax is due. It is a deadline. What we have to say to the people that were affected by this is that the temporary disaster piece of this program is coming to an end. It is time now to make some permanent decisions, and we have been talking about what some of those permanent options are.

There is housing available in New Orleans, but there is housing available in some of the communities that these people are residing in. What we do is we keep pushing forward, keep pushing forward, families finally having to decide where do we go from here? It is time for many of those families to move on, and, unfortunately, we keep using Katrina as a way to increase programs that ought to be debated in other committees and at other times. More vouchers, more vouchers. What we need to do is set a date certain.

Now, as the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee mentioned, the President of the United States has, in fact, extended these benefits. But what we also heard is in those circumstances where we didn't extend some of the programs, that there was life after that.

Sometimes the toughest love that you can do for someone to get them moving on, to help them to move on from a traumatic situation is actually force them to move on and go to the next step. What I think the gentleman's amendment does is it does not cause the process to have a stopping point for the temporary disaster and where we begin to talk about it more permanent.

I agree with the gentleman that FEMA is not the agency to do housing. HUD is set up to do housing. We have been talking about there are things in this bill that will help HUD, help the housing authority to get the permanent housing piece moving forward. But the longer we prolong this disaster and call it a temporary relief, I believe the longer we do the families that we are really trying to help a disservice.

I agree with the gentleman that FEMA is not the agency to do housing. HUD is set up to do housing. We have been talking about there are things in this bill that will help HUD, help the housing authority to get the permanent housing piece moving forward. But the longer we prolong this disaster and call it a temporary relief, I believe the longer we do the families that we are really trying to help a disservice.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

My response is that this is only for persons who are eligible to receive the relief. This means that persons must be eligible for the section 8 vouchers to receive the vouchers. This is not for people who just happen to be in need of someplace to stay and may be making \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year. They must qualify.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the honorable gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the former Chair of the CBC.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am struck because I was here about 15 or 20 minutes ago debating the last amendment. We operate in a structure that requires us to deal with one amendment at a time, and when you deal with one amendment at a time, you kind of get segmented into these

little places that you are. But the thing that is astonishing here in this opposition to this amendment is that if you look at it in the context of the last amendment and this amendment, I don't know what it is you all would have these people do for housing.

In the last amendment, you said we don't want to build or renovate or restore any public housing in New Orleans because we want to do community development in New Orleans, and that is going to take a long time, and it is counterproductive to restore public housing in New Orleans while we are doing this community development.

Then in the next amendment you say, well, we don't want to give people vouchers so they can in the meantime stay in Houston, Texas, or Charlotte, North Carolina, or California or anywhere else.

Then my colleague gets up and starts his comments by saying, well, we are all working toward the same objective.

I keep wondering what that objective is. Our objective is to house these people temporarily and long term. Then in the last amendment you cut off the notion that you would house them long term because you don't want to renovate public housing. In this amendment you are cutting off the notion that you will house them short term because you don't want to give them vouchers to have housing immediately.

So when and where are you planning to house these people? Now, there is, my colleague reminded me, a NASA facility in Houston. Maybe you would like for us to put them on a spaceship and send them out.

My friends, these are not welfare recipients. Even if you have these stereotypes about these people feasting at the trough, these are people who were displaced by a hurricane. Regardless of these images that you may have about welfare recipients, these are people, these are our United States citizens who were displaced by a natural disaster, and all we are trying to do is provide housing for them, both on an immediate basis and on a long-term basis.

They have had three or four cutoffs now where one day they are sitting in a hotel and they are told, your assistance is being cut off. Imagine what that does for family values and for the notion of stability.

Have a heart and let's pass this amendment so that we can provide some housing to these people.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time during this amendment to publicly thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. FRANK, for his graciousness during the markup and the hearings on this bill and for his willingness to give us real input into this bill.

There are 13 components of this legislation that we are not out here on the

floor asking for an amendment to be because the chairman consented to their inclusion. I believe that those matters which separate us are less than those that we agree on.

This was a major disaster. It is the largest natural disaster this country has faced by many times.

□ 1730

That we are struggling on some consensus on what we do going forward is predictable, and I will say in the defense of my colleagues, we are simply saying that we don't want some of the units replaced on a one-on-one basis. We know of 2,000 units that were either vacant or slated for demolition at the time of the hurricane. It is particularly those units that Mrs. BIGGERT has said in her amendment do not need to be replaced.

There are many displaced New Orleans residents who may choose not to come back. Others like the flexibility of the section 8 voucher. We have also not said that we want folks that are displaced off these vouchers. We are simply saying it should not be a permanent situation.

The gentleman from North Carolina mentioned the word "housing." We do not see this as a housing issue. We see this as a quality-of-life issue. We do not want to recreate housing projects like the one in Atlanta where 70 percent—

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, and I will yield the time back to you if necessary.

Mr. BACHUS. I am not opposing your amendment. I am not speaking in opposition to your amendment.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you.

Mr. BACHUS. What I am speaking about, and I think there is agreement on both sides of the aisle, that when you have a housing project where a large percentage, even a majority of the young men that grow up in that housing project end up in a State penitentiary, we need to do something different.

We don't need to delay. Whether it is by renovating a unit that 2 years from now is slated for demolition, we just don't think that is the wisest use of taxpayer money.

And I do see that to do that, we are going to have to have vouchers and continue people on section 8 if we are to do long-term solutions. I think the gentleman from North Carolina made a valid point when he said that. That is something that should not be rejected out of hand.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from Alabama. He is right, we accepted a number of amendments, and there is a great deal that joins us together. But there are some differences,



and I think in the spirit of democracy, we should debate these differences.

In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and this amendment as we debate it, there seems to be this view, as my friend from North Carolina said, that these are people who need to be jolted out of this welfare way of life. The gentleman from Texas wanted to subject these people to a 20-hour work requirement where no work needed to be done.

Here we are objecting to these people staying on section 8 because we want, as my other friend from Texas said, we are going to have some tough love.

Let's remember who we are talking about. These are people who were working overwhelmingly. They were working at lousy jobs for low pay. These were people who were doing work in the service industry. They were living in not great circumstances, and their homes and their jobs were washed away. They were driven out of their homes to strange places. Some of those places have been very welcoming, and I was pleased to see the Kennedy family give the mayor of Houston a Profile in Courage Award for the generosity that he has shown in welcoming people. But that is who we are talking about.

People had said, well, we want to improve the quality of their life. Do Members think, Mr. Chairman, that poor people are so dumb that they are voluntarily living in worse places than would otherwise be available to them? They are not living in great circumstances, but they are the best they can find and afford. When you displace them from what they have without providing them alternatives, you are likely to make them worse off.

Now, I understand there is a problem that some people might not fully deserve what they get, but overwhelmingly here is what we are talking about: people who had jobs and homes in New Orleans and maybe some other parts of Louisiana whose homes and jobs were washed away. And they are now living in emergency conditions provided by FEMA, and they haven't yet been able to fix it.

People ask, Why don't they go back to New Orleans? Well, we have a chicken-and-an-egg problem. We have a problem where there are no jobs because there is no place for the people to live.

In Mississippi along the gulf, the Oreck vacuum cleaner company opened up a plant after the hurricane and then closed it because they couldn't get workers because there wasn't housing. We are trying to build housing.

Vouchers in New Orleans is the problem. According to HUD's own figures, more than half of the rental housing units in New Orleans were destroyed by the storm. How do you expect these people to go back?

Now we have a bill that I am very proud of. The gentlewoman from California has worked very hard on this. We got organized on January 30. A

week later we had our first hearing. A month later we had our markup. We are now on the floor. This has been a very high priority for us, to try to break this cycle of no job and no housing and no way to get back and no way to live and no decent life. And, yes, we are trying to build housing and we hope that the housing brings jobs.

Will there be some problems? Yes. But I have to say, if we are going to err, can we not err on the side of people who are poor in many cases to begin with and whose hard jobs, and in some cases meager homes were destroyed, and they were driven out of those homes by a force of nature and they are living in Texas and they are living in Atlanta, and they are being told tough love. We don't think the quality of your life is good enough.

We don't think you are trying hard enough. Is that what Members think?

These are among the toughest people around that they are still integrated and they are still with their families given what they have been through, the physical and emotional horrors of that hurricane and the lack of any action afterwards. Can we not resolve together to say to these people, look, we are going to work to try to help rebuild New Orleans. Until then, we will assure you can live in these places.

These vouchers people will get are what we call disappearing vouchers. They are not permanent additions to the voucher stock. They are for the people who were displaced from New Orleans, and as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, as long as they are economically eligible.

I don't think they all want to stay there and live in these temporary quarters. As they do find alternative ways to live, the voucher will disappear. So that is what we are talking about: thousands of our fellow human beings who were subjected to physical terrors and emotional troubles far greater than most of us, fortunately for us, will ever have to go through. Their homes and their jobs were destroyed. Their children were uprooted from schools. They were driven away from where they used to live. And they have then been put under the tender mercies of FEMA. And as my friend from Texas said, every so often they were told, you know what, there hasn't been enough trauma in your life, the flood, the deaths, all that, that's not enough. Now we are going to threaten you with eviction. Now you won't know where you're going to live.

What we are saying is let's say to these remaining people, while we are trying to rebuild New Orleans, we give you assurance that you will be able to live in the circumstances in which you are now living as long as you meet the guidelines. I don't understand the opposition to that. I don't understand why that brings Members to say tough love, we are going to improve the quality of their life.

Let's let these people at least have what they now have: a home that was

something they were able to put together after that great trauma. And the alternative is people say they shouldn't worry, the President will extend it.

What do you say to your 8-year-old and 12-year-old when they ask: Where am I going to school next year? Oh, don't worry, the President will extend it.

Frankly, there are a lot of people here who wouldn't feel a great comfort in that, let alone an 8-year-old.

We are dealing with totally innocent people, hardworking people whose lives were already tough, were destroyed by a hurricane and they were forced physically out of their homes. We are saying instead of them continuing to live under the fear that they may be evicted, that they may have no further support in terms of their basic living, that we as a compassionate Nation will continue to make sure that they at least have a place to live while everything else goes forward. I hope the House will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What this really boils down to, I think, and the problems we are having in communication is what to do with the long-term disaster housing. We haven't faced something like this before.

We have the disaster vouchers. We have the section 8 vouchers, and how do we make this all work. I think we all care about what is happening to these families. It has been over 18 months. We are concerned. People need to get on with their lives.

I don't think we are really asking for anything different except that we think that this is unnecessary because the President has the flexibility now to do what we are talking about. I think we should leave it. We think we should leave it to the administration to determine when, whether, and for how long to extend the housing aid through FEMA.

I agree, most of the families and individuals in the FEMA-sponsored housing are living in travel trailers that are not suitable for long-term housing. Just think of a family living in a trailer for the long term. I think extending the assistance will prolong this unsuitable housing arrangement.

I think FEMA is working now to determine, with Federal and State partners, to address the potential for what is going to happen for long-term housing needs as a result of these hurricanes.

We are setting precedent here. Let's hope we never have something like this again. I think this is moving along.

It will increase the amount of this bill if these vouchers are made permanent, but maybe we need to sit down and really work out what are disaster vouchers, and we already are working on section 8 vouchers; and we have jumped ahead on some of these things. I know everybody is enthusiastic on

this committee and wants to do everything right now, but we have a whole consideration of section 8 vouchers. And to extend FEMA and then turn them into permanent vouchers, section 8 vouchers, and I know they have to be eligible, but we really need to sit down and determine and debate what are really the long-term ramifications of what is going on.

I think some of these things can be worked out later. We don't have to do everything at once. I think this already is a costly bill, and I think we should wait to determine some of these things.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS), the honorable subcommittee Chair.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to stand and give my strong support to this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for working on this amendment and strengthening this legislation.

I am tired of the headlines at the end of one of these periods of time when the temporary assistance has run out, the headlines that say all of those people out there who are living in temporary situations are going to have to get off, they will not be supported any more, that their assistance has run out, and then legislators go running to beat up on FEMA. And then FEMA, after a few days or so, will make another extension. Time out. It is time for us to help people get some kind of permanency to their existence. This amendment will do that.

This amendment will simply say for those people who are living in trailers and all of this temporary housing, some of it is really not fit to live in, in places where we are spending money with the temporary vouchers, will now be given the opportunity with the passage of this amendment and this legislation to begin to reorder their lives and to go ahead and come home and get jobs, jobs that are needed, not only by those families but the infrastructures that need to be rebuilt by those people who will be there to do these jobs. All of this can happen with this kind of permanent voucher.

I think it is important to note, it has been said here that these vouchers will be given only to those people who are eligible for them. When they are no longer eligible, they will cease to exist. I don't know how you can be any fairer than that.

So we are talking about moving from temporary status to permanent status. When you don't need it any more, it is gone.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), who is also a part of the committee.

□ 1745

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me throw my whole-hearted support be-

hind this amendment. I think it is a clear expression of the generosity, the common sense and the decency of our country, and I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment.

The fact is that until we see the people of the gulf coast as our people, as opposed to those people, we will not be the kind of America we need to be. We will be less than we ought to be.

So I just want to say that extending housing to people who need it, victims of a disaster, not a human failing but a disaster, a natural disaster, is the just, right thing to do, and we should not allow what was a natural disaster to be a political disaster.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, many of the persons who will receive these vouchers are persons who will be working full time and living below the poverty line, persons who are what we call extremely low-income persons, making around \$12,000 per year. Does someone argue that a person making \$12,000 per year should not receive some assistance for housing? That is what we are talking about, persons working below the poverty line full time, family of two. You are making about \$13,000 if you are going to reach poverty line, and these vouchers go away. They are not vouchers that are permanent. They are only there to help as needed, and once the need ceases to exist, the vouchers will cease to exist.

People are suffering. Moving from one deadline to another deadline causes a lot of stress in the lives of the persons who have these vouchers or who have these temporary living conditions, and their children are suffering. The children are in schools. At some point people want to know that they have stability, that their children can attend the same school all year long, that at Christmastime there is no threat that they will have to move from one place to another. At some point we have to give them the stability that they deserve.

Finally, people still cry. They have tears to well in their eyes when they talk about what happened to them. Why would we continue to compound what is already a distressful situation by adding additional stress to their lives by threatening them with eviction?

In closing, I mention only that we have the ability to do the right thing, or we can try to do something right. We can try to put a process in place. I say it is time for us to do the right thing, and in the process, I think we will be doing something the right way as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Again, I think we are talking about the same thing; it is just how we get there.

What we are saying is that right now FEMA has provided temporary assistance. When it has been needed to extend, it has been extended. If people finally have found housing, and they qualify for Section 8 vouchers, they will be able to get them, but let FEMA work to address the problem and the potential for long-term housing needs as a result of the hurricane.

I just do not think that this amendment is necessary because it has been taken care of by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), as modified.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mrs. BIGGERT of Illinois.

Amendment No. 5, as modified, by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 266, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—162

Aderholt	Bonner	Cantor
Akin	Bono	Carter
Alexander	Boozman	Chabot
Bachmann	Boustany	Cole (OK)
Baker	Brady (TX)	Conaway
Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Bartlett (MD)	Buchanan	Cubin
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Cuellar
Billray	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Buyer	Davis, David
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Davis, Tom
Blackburn	Camp (MI)	Deal (GA)
Blunt	Campbell (CA)	Doolittle
Boehner	Cannon	Drake

Dreier	Jordan	Poe	Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner	Buchanan	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Duncan	Keller	Price (GA)	Moore (KS)	Ross	Tauscher	Burgess	Heller	Petri
Ehlers	King (IA)	Putnam	Moore (WI)	Rothman	Taylor	Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Pitts
English (PA)	Kingston	Radanovich	Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	Buyer	Herger	Platts
Everett	Kline (MN)	Rehberg	Murphy (CT)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Calvert	Hobson	Poe
Fallin	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)	Murphy, Patrick	Rush	Tierney	Camp (MI)	Hoekstra	Porter
Feeney	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Murtha	Ryan (OH)	Towns	Campbell (CA)	Hulshof	Price (GA)
Flake	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)	Nadler	Salazar	Udall (CO)	Cannon	Hunter	Putnam
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (NM)	Cantor	Inglis (SC)	Radanovich
Fortenberry	Linder	Roskam	Neal (MA)	T.	Van Hollen	Capito	Issa	Ramstad
Fortuño	LoBiondo	Royce	Norton	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Carter	Jindal	Regula
Fossella	Lucas	Ryan (WI)	Oberstar	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Castle	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Sali	Obey	Schakowsky	Walden (OR)	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Franks (AZ)	E.	Saxton	Oliver	Schiff	Walsh (NY)	Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Schmidt	Ortiz	Schwartz	Walsh (NY)	Conaway	Jordan	Reynolds
Gallegly	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Pallone	Scott (GA)	Walz (MN)	Cooper	Keller	Rogers (AL)
Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)	Shadegg	Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Shimkus	Pastor	Serrano	Schultz	Cubin	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Gohmert	McCotter	Shuster	Payne	Sestak	Waters	Culberson	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Goode	McCrery	Simpson	Perlmutter	Shays	Watson	Davis (KY)	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Peterson (MN)	Shea-Porter	Watt	Davis, David	Kline (MN)	Roskam
Granger	McKeon	Smith (TX)	Platts	Sherman	Waxman	Davis, Tom	Knollenberg	Royce
Graves	McMorris	Souder	Pomeroy	Shuler	Weiner	Deal (GA)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Hall (TX)	Rodgers	Stearns	Porter	Sires	Welch (VT)	Dent	LaHood	Sali
Hastert	Melancon	Sullivan	Price (NC)	Skelton	Weller	Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Saxton
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Tancredo	Price (OH)	Slaughter	Wexler	Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham	Schmidt
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Terry	Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield	Doolittle	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Heller	Miller (MI)	Thornberry	Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Wilson (NM)	Drake	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Tiahrt	Rangel	Snyder	Wilson (OH)	Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Herger	Moran (KS)	Tiberi	Regula	Solis	Wolf	Duncan	Linder	Shimkus
Hill	Murphy, Tim	Turner	Reichert	Space	Woolsey	Emerson	LoBiondo	Shuster
Hoekstra	Musgrave	Upton	Renzi	Spratt	Wu	Everett	Lucas	Simpson
Holden	Myrick	Walberg	Reyes	Stark	Wynn	English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Hulshof	Neugebauer	Wamp	Reynolds	Stupak	Yarmuth	Everett	E.	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Nunes	Weldon (FL)	Rodriguez	Sutton		Fallin	Mack	Smith (TX)
Inglis (SC)	Paul	Westmoreland				Fox	Manzullo	Souder
Issa	Pearce	Wicker	Coble	Kucinich	Pence	Ferguson	Marchant	Stearns
Jindal	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Larson (CT)	Sessions	Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Johnson (IL)	Petri	Young (AK)	Faleomavaega	Mack		Forbes	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Young (FL)	Kanjorski	Meehan		Fortenberry	McCollum (MN)	Terry
Jones (NC)	Pitts					Fortuño	McCotter	Thornberry
						Fossella	McCrery	Tiahrt
						Fox	McHenry	Tiberi
						Franks (AZ)	McHugh	Turner
						Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Upton
						Gallegly	McKeon	Walberg
						Garrett (NJ)	McMorris	Walsh (NY)
						Gerlach	Rodgers	Walsh (NY)
						Gilchrest	Mica	Wamp
						Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
						Gingrey	Miller (MI)	Weller
						Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
						Goode	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
						Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim	Wicker
						Granger	Musgrave	Wilson (NM)
						Graves	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
						Hall (TX)	Neugebauer	Wolf
						Hastert	Nunes	Young (AK)
						Hastings (WA)	Paul	Young (FL)
							Pearce	

## NOES—266

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Inslee
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Israel
Allen	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Altmire	Davis (KY)	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Davis, Lincoln	(TX)
Arcuri	DeFazio	Jefferson
Baca	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Bachus	Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	DeLauro	Jones (OH)
Baldwin	Dent	Kagen
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Bean	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy
Becerra	Dicks	Kildee
Berkley	Dingell	Kilpatrick
Berman	Doggett	Kind
Berry	Donnelly	King (NY)
Biggert	Doyle	Kirk
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Klein (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	LaHood
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Lampson
Bordallo	Emanuel	Langevin
Boren	Emerson	Lantos
Boswell	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Boucher	Eshoo	Latham
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	LaTourette
Boyda (KS)	Farr	Lee
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Levin
Braley (IA)	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Ginny	Gerlach	Loebsack
Butterfield	Giffords	Lofgren, Zoe
Capito	Gilchrest	Lowe
Capps	Gillibrand	Lynch
Capuano	Gillmor	Mahoney (FL)
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)
Carnahan	Gordon	Markley
Carney	Green, Al	Marshall
Carson	Green, Gene	Matheson
Castle	Grijalva	Matsui
Castor	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Chandler	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Christensen	Hare	McDermott
Clarke	Harman	McGovern
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McHugh
Cleaver	Herse	McIntyre
Clyburn	Higgins	McNerney
Cohen	Hinchey	McNulty
Conyers	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hirono	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Hobson	Michaud
Costello	Hodes	Millender-
Courtney	Holt	McDonald
Cramer	Honda	Miller (NC)
Crowley	Hooey	Miller, George
Cummings	Hoyer	Mitchell

## NOT VOTING—10

Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Pence
Faleomavaega	Larson (CT)	Sessions
Kanjorski	Mack	
	Meehan	

## □ 1817

Messrs. FILNER, AL GREEN of Texas, SCOTT of Virginia, SERRANO, GRIJALVA and Ms. SOLIS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HOLDEN, SMITH of Texas, FOSSELLA, PICKERING, SALI and CHABOT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

## AYES—198

Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Akin	Biggert	Bono
Alexander	Bilbray	Boozman
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Boustany
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Ginny

Abercrombie	Clay	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Cleaver	Gordon
Allen	Clyburn	Green, Al
Altmire	Cohen	Green, Gene
Andrews	Conyers	Grijalva
Arcuri	Costa	Gutierrez
Baca	Costello	Hall (NY)
Baird	Courtney	Hare
Baldwin	Cramer	Harman
Barrow	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Bean	Cuellar	Herse
Becerra	Cummings	Higgins
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Hill
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hinchey
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hodes
Blumenauer	DeGette	Holden
Bordallo	Delahunt	Holt
Boren	DeLauro	Honda
Boswell	Dicks	Hooey
Boucher	Dingell	Hoyer
Boyd (FL)	Doggett	Inslee
Boyda (KS)	Donnelly	Israel
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	(TX)
Butterfield	Ellsworth	Jefferson
Capps	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Carnahan	Etheridge	Kagen
Carney	Farr	Kaptur
Carson	Fattah	Kennedy
Castor	Filner	Kildee
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Christensen	Giffords	Kind
Clarke	Gillibrand	Klein (FL)

Lampson	Nadler	Sherman	Brown, Corrine	Hodes	Pastor	Gohmert	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (AL)
Langevin	Napolitano	Shuler	Buchanan	Holden	Payne	Goode	E.	Rogers (KY)
Lantos	Neal (MA)	Sires	Burgess	Holt	Perlmutter	Goodlatte	Mack	Rogers (MI)
Larsen (WA)	Norton	Skelton	Butterfield	Honda	Peterson (MN)	Granger	Manzullo	Rohrabacher
Larson (CT)	Oberstar	Slaughter	Capps	Hookey	Pickering	Graves	Marchant	Roskam
Lee	Obey	Smith (WA)	Capuano	Hoyer	Pomeroy	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Royce
Levin	Oliver	Snyder	Cardoza	Inslee	Price (NC)	Hastert	McCaul (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Solis	Carnahan	Israel	Rahall	Hastings (WA)	McCotter	Sali
Lipinski	Pallone	Space	Carney	Jackson (IL)	Rangel	Hayes	McCrery	Saxton
Loeb sack	Pascarell	Spratt	Carson	Jackson-Lee	Reyes	Heller	McHenry	Schmidt
Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor	Stark	Castor	(TX)	Rodriguez	Hensarling	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Lowey	Payne	Stupak	Chandler	Jefferson	Ros-Lehtinen	Herger	McKeon	Shadegg
Lynch	Perlmutter	Sutton	Christensen	Johnson (GA)	Ross	Hobson	McMorris	Shimkus
Mahoney (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Tanner	Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman	Hoekstra	Rodgers	Shuster
Maloney (NY)	Pickering	Tauscher	Clay	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard	Hulshof	Mica	Simpson
Markey	Pomeroy	Taylor	Cleaver	Kagen	Ruppersberger	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)	Clyburn	Kaptur	Rush	Inglis (SC)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)	Cohen	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)	Issa	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Rahall	Tierney	Conyers	Kildee	Salazar	Jindal	Moran (KS)	Souder
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Towns	Cooper	Kilpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Johnson (IL)	Musgrave	Stearns
McDermott	Reyes	Udall (CO)	Costa	Kind	T.	Jones (NC)	Myrick	Sullivan
McGovern	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)	Costello	Klein (FL)	Sánchez, Loretta	Jordan	Neugebauer	Tancred
McIntyre	Ross	Van Hollen	Courtney	Lampson	Sarbanes	Keller	Nunes	Terry
McNerney	Rothman	Velázquez	Cramer	Langevin	Schakowsky	King (IA)	Paul	Thornberry
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	Crowley	Lantos	Schiff	King (NY)	Pearce	Tiahrt
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Walz (MN)	Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz	Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Wasserman	Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)	Kirk	Pitts	Turner
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Schultz	Davis (AL)	Lee	Scott (VA)	Kline (MN)	Platts	Upton
Michaud	Salazar	Waters	Davis (CA)	Levin	Serrano	Knollenberg	Poe	Walberg
Millender-	Sánchez, Linda	Watson	Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sestak	Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Walden (OR)
Donald	T.	Watt	Davis, Lincoln	Lipinski	Shays	LaHood	Price (GA)	Wamp
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Loretta	Waxman	DeFazio	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter	Lamborn	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Miller, George	Sarbanes	Weiner	DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman	Latham	Putnam	Weller
Mitchell	Schakowsky	Welch (VT)	Delahunt	Lowey	Shuler	LaTourette	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Schiff	Wexler	DeLauro	Lynch	Sires	Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Whitfield
Moore (KS)	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)	Dent	Maloney (NY)	Skelton	Lewis (KY)	Regula	Wicker
Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)	Woolsey	Diaz-Balart, L.	Markey	Slaughter	Linder	Rehberg	Wilson (NM)
Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)	Wu	Diaz-Balart, M.	Marshall	Smith (WA)	LoBiondo	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (CT)	Serrano	Wynn	Dingell	Matheson	Snyder	Lucas	Renzi	Wolf
Murphy, Patrick	Sestak	Yarmuth	Doggett	Matsui	Solis		Reynolds	Young (FL)
Murtha	Shea-Porter		Donnelly	McCarthy (NY)	Space			

## NOT VOTING—8

Coble	Kanjorski	Pence
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Sessions
Faleomavaega	Meehan	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1825

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), as modified, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 184, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—246

Abercrombie	Barrow	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Bean	Bordallo
Allen	Becerra	Boren
Altmire	Berkley	Boswell
Andrews	Berman	Boucher
Arcuri	Berry	Boyd (FL)
Baca	Bilirakis	Boyd (KS)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Doolittle
Akin	Ginny	Drake
Alexander	Burton (IN)	Dreier
Bachmann	Buyer	Duncan
Bachus	Calvert	Ehlers
Baker	Camp (MI)	English (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Campbell (CA)	Everett
Bartlett (MD)	Cannon	Fallin
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Feeney
Biggart	Capito	Ferguson
Bilbray	Carter	Flake
Bishop (UT)	Castle	Forbes
Blackburn	Chabot	Fortenberry
Blunt	Cole (OK)	Fortuño
Boehner	Conaway	Fossella
Bonner	Crenshaw	Fox
Bono	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Boozman	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Gallely
Brady (TX)	Davis, David	Garrett (NJ)
Brown (SC)	Davis, Tom	Gillmor
	Deal (GA)	Gingrey

## NOES—184

## NOT VOTING—8

Coble	Kanjorski	Pence
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Sessions
Faleomavaega	Meehan	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1835

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from “aye” to “no.” Mr. BURGESS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina, had come to no resolution thereon.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b-3, amended by section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's and minority leader's joint appointment of the following individuals to the House of Representatives Page Board for a term of 1 year:

Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein of Maryland

Mr. Adam Jones of Michigan

#### REPORT ON H.R. 1591, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. OBEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-60) on the bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, in addition to Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Chairman, appointed on February 7, 2007:

Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio  
Mr. HONDA, California  
Mr. UDALL, New Mexico  
Mr. WALZ, Minnesota  
Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois  
Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania  
Mr. ROYCE, California  
Mr. SMITH, New Jersey

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE LEAST AMONG US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we will all be judged by how we treat the least among us. Nowhere is that more true than in Iraq.

Two international headlines tell us of the devastation that is now Iraq. The first: "Silent Victims: What Will Become of Iraq's Children?"

And the second: "World Ignoring Iraqi Refugees."

These headlines from CNN and the BBC, respectively, tell of the Iraqi victims of the occupation. While our brave men and women in uniform have done so much to try to improve the lives of average Iraqi families, the policies of the Bush administration have failed

them and failed the Iraqi families in this regard.

A recently released report from the U.N. found that nearly two million people have been displaced by the occupation of Iraq. Many of these refugees are seeking homes within Jordan and Syria. The report estimates that a quarter of these refugees are children, children who lack education opportunities and a normal, safe childhood.

It seems like the so-called mission is far from being accomplished. Iraqis are begging to leave Iraq's violence and instability. Thousands upon thousands of applications for residency in the United States have been denied, even for those who served alongside our troops as translators and as guides.

Four years ago the President promised an Iraq flourishing under a stable democracy. When children are afraid to go to school and parents are fearful of even taking a trip to the local market, President Bush's promise adds up to a total failure.

One child, a fourth grader, who was profiled in the CNN piece said: "They killed me father and uncle in front of my eyes." He was unable to continue because he broke down and he sobbed. This is the legacy that we are leaving for Iraq's future generation.

It is clear that our presence in Iraq is bringing more violence and more instability. Our presence may have given rise to a strong and deadly terrorist movement within the Iraqi civil war. Let's be honest. It is well past time to bring our troops home and let the Iraqi people regain their sovereignty.

Let me be clear: we must not withdraw our support of the Iraqi people. We should be investing in the political, fiscal, and social infrastructure of Iraq. We must help to provide for the most basic needs, including education, electricity, drinkable water, sanitation, and security. In the now famous words: "Mr. President, you broke it, you buy it."

My colleagues, it is time to bring our troops home. It is time to restore hope for the Iraqi people. It is the very least that we can do.

□ 1845

#### RENAMING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since 1947 Congress has twice affirmed that the Marine Corps is a separate military service within the Department of the Navy. In 1947, the National Security Act stated that we have four separate military services: the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

In 1986, the Goldwater-Nichols Act formally acknowledged the roles of each service's commanding officer and stated that each branch's commander

serves equally as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

For the past 5 years, this House has sent legislation to the Senate that would rename the Department of the Navy to be the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Not only has this change received support from the full House Armed Services Committee and the House itself, but by such notables as Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitz; Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Lawrence Garrett, III; Acting Secretary of the Navy Daniel Howard; Secretary of the Navy John Dalton; General Carl Mundy, 30th Commandant of the Marine Corps; General Chuck Krulak, 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps; the Fleet Reserve Association; the Marine Corps League; the National Defense PAC; and the National Association of Uniformed Services.

Wade Sanders, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs, 1993 to 1998, also declared his support for this change. He stated: "As a combat veteran and former naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that: a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of the partnership."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share part of an editorial published last year in the Chicago Tribune, and I will submit the entire editorial for the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 21, 2006]

STEP UP FOR THE MARINES

(Editorials)

No service branch shows more respect for tradition than the U.S. Marine Corps does, which makes it all the more ironic that tradition denies the corps an important show of respect: Equal billing with the other service branches.

The Continental Congress ordered "two Battalions of Marines" to be raised in 1775 as landing forces for the Navy. The Marines have remained within the Navy on government organization charts ever since, even though the corps functions through wartime and peacetime as a separate branch in every other way.

Like the Army, Navy and Air Force, the Marine Corps has its own command structure. Its commandant holds equal status with other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which happens to be chaired for the first time by a Marine, Gen. Peter Pace.

Several Marine veterans and supporters have launched an online petition drive to support a bill proposed by Rep. Walter B. Jones. The North Carolina Republican, whose district includes Camp Lejeune, wants to fix the matter simply by changing the Department of the Navy to the "Department of the Navy and Marine Corps."

Jones has twice passed similar measures in the House with bipartisan support, but the Senate was cool to them. Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John Warner, a Virginia Republican, veteran and former Navy secretary, has promised "fair consideration" for the legislation. That's Senate-speak for a reluctance to commit. His reluctance seems to be rooted in a sense of tradition. But sometimes it's good to break with tradition. The War Department, for example,

became the Defense Department after World War II. The Army Air Corps was elevated in 1941 to the Army Air Forces and in 1947 to the autonomous Air Force.

The Marines have not asked for complete autonomy. Nothing structurally needs to change in their relationship with the Navy, which has served both branches well. The corps only asks for recognition. Having served their nation proudly and courageously since colonial days, the leathernecks have earned a promotion.

Mr. Speaker, I quote the Chicago Tribune: "No service branch shows more respect for tradition than the United States Marine Corps . . . which makes it all the more ironic that tradition denies the Corps an important show of respect, equal billing with the other service branches . . . But sometimes it is good to break with tradition."

"The Marines have not asked for complete autonomy. Nothing structurally needs to change in their relationship with the Navy, which has served both branches well. The Corps only asks for recognition."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this change and cosponsor H.R. 346.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a poster of a marine who gave his life for this country. He was killed in Iraq. His family received, after his death, the Silver Star. And what I have on this poster is from the Secretary of the Navy. It says: "The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Silver Star to the family of Sergeant Michael Bitz. The sad part of this is, Mr. Speaker, he was a marine who died for this country. He was a team member with the United States Navy; yet the citation has nothing but the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy flag."

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at this as I show you what it could be if this bill becomes law. What it would be with the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps with the Navy flag and the Marine flag. That is what this bill would do.

And, Mr. Speaker, before I close, I say to my colleagues in the House I hope you will join me as cosponsor and maybe this year the Senate will accept the House position because, Mr. Speaker, this man left three children, twins he never saw, and when they look at this honor that his father received, wouldn't it be nice 20 years from now for his family to say, "My daddy was a marine who gave his life for this country," and it be recognized in the heading of this citation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## COMMEMORATING THE 186TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in observance of the 186th anniversary of Greek independence.

In 1821 when Greek patriots revolted against their Ottoman oppressors, they sounded a clarion call for liberty that was heard by freedom-loving men and women all over Europe and around the world.

On March 25 we celebrate a courageous struggle for independence that spanned 8 long and hard-fought years, creating a foundation for the modern Greek state.

Americans and Greeks have long shared a profound commitment to the principles of democracy, and both peoples have worked to create societies built upon these values. Throughout history each nation has taken inspiration from the other's experience.

In 1823 Greek patriot, intellectual, and physician Adamantios Koraes wrote one of many letters to his friend Thomas Jefferson seeking counsel on how to draw up a constitution for Greece to use upon its liberation. Jefferson wrote extensively in response, expounding the virtues and the fundamentals of the freedoms we cherish today: freedom of religion; freedom of person, habeas corpus; trial by jury; the exclusive right of legislation and taxation reserved to the representatives of the people; and freedom of the press. Greek Independence Day marks the moment the people of Greece realized these freedoms.

A shared commitment to liberty has been the hallmark of our collective histories. In the two world wars, Greece fought heroically in the allied campaign to maintain liberty and democracy. Similarly, during the Cold War, Greece fought against totalitarian aggression and emerged as a democratic nation with a vigorous economy, a strong partner in the United States, and a full member of both NATO and the European Union. Most recently, Greece's tremendous performance as host to the 2004 Olympic Games has shone a light on what this longstanding commitment to democratic values and institutions can yield.

Mr. Speaker, this occasion also offers us an opportunity to reflect on the enormous and distinctive contributions that Greek Americans have made to every aspect of life in our Nation, including the arts, business, science, public service, and scholarship. As Greek Americans have made this remarkable progress, they have also preserved important traditional values of hard work, education, and commitment to family and church, principles that strengthen and invigorate our communities.

In one of his letters to Koraes, Jefferson wrote this: "Possessing ourselves

the combined blessings of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries and to none more than yours, which, the first of civilizations, provided examples of what man should be."

In America and Greece we choose this day to celebrate the courage, the liberty, and democracy that is the foundation of every civilized society.

## THE REAL REASON TO OPPOSE THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a \$124 billion supplemental appropriation is a good bill, to oppose. I am pleased that many of my colleagues will join me in voting against this measure.

If one is unhappy with our progress in Iraq after 4 years of war, voting to defund the war makes sense. If one is unhappy with the manner in which we went to war without a constitutional declaration, voting "no" makes equally good sense.

Voting "no" also makes the legitimate point that the Constitution does not authorize Congress to direct the management of any military operation. The President clearly enjoys this authority as Commander in Chief.

But Congress, just as clearly, is responsible for making policy, by debating and declaring war, raising and equipping armies, funding military operations, and ending conflicts that do not serve our national interests.

Congress failed to meet its responsibilities 4 years ago, unconstitutionally transferring its explicit war power to the executive branch. Even though the administration started the subsequent preemptive war in Iraq, Congress bears the greatest responsibility for its lack of courage in fulfilling its duties. Since then Congress has obediently provided the funds and troops required to pursue this illegitimate war.

We won't solve the problems in Iraq until we confront our failed policy of foreign interventionism. This latest appropriation does nothing to solve our dilemma. Micromanaging the war while continuing to fund it won't help our troops.

Here is a new approach: Congress should admit its mistake and repeal the authority wrongfully given to the executive branch in 2002. Repeal the congressional sanction and disavow Presidential discretion in starting wars. Then start bringing the troops home.

If anyone charges that this approach does not support the troops, take a poll. Find out how Reservists and Guardsman and their families, many on their second or third tours in Iraq, feel about it.

The constant refrain that bringing our troops home would demonstrate a lack of support for them must be one of



the most amazing distortions ever foisted on the American public. We are so concerned about saving face, but whose face are we saving? A sensible policy would save American lives and follow the rules laid out for Congress in the Constitution, and avoid wars that have no purpose.

The claim that it is unpatriotic to oppose spending more money in Iraq must be laid to rest as fraudulent. We should pass a resolution that expresses congressional opposition to any more undeclared, unconstitutional, unnecessary, preemptive wars. We should be building a consensus for the future that makes it easier to end our current troubles in Iraq.

It is amazing to me that this Congress is more intimidated by political propagandists and special interests than the American electorate, who sent a loud, clear message about the war in November. The large majority of Americans now want us out of Iraq.

Our leaders cannot grasp the tragic consequences of our policies toward Iraq for the past 25 years. It is time we woke them up. We are still by far the greatest military power on Earth; but since we stubbornly refuse to understand the nature of our foes, we are literally defeating ourselves.

In 2004 bin Laden stated that al Qaeda's goal was to bankrupt the United States. His second in command, Zawahiri, is quoted as saying that the 9/11 attacks would cause Americans to "come and fight the war personally on our sand where they are within rifle range."

Sadly, we are playing into their hands. This \$124 billion appropriation is only part of the nearly \$1 trillion in military spending for this year's budget alone. We should be concerned about the coming bankruptcy and the crisis facing the U.S. dollar.

We have totally failed to adapt to modern warfare. We are dealing with a small, nearly invisible enemy, an enemy without a country, a government, an army, a navy, an air force, or missiles. Yet our enemy is armed with suicidal determination and motivated by our meddling in their regional affairs to destroy us.

As we bleed financially, our men and women in Iraq die needlessly while the injured swell Walter Reed Hospital. Our government systematically undermines the Constitution and the liberties it is supposed to protect, for which it has claimed our soldiers are dying in faraway places.

Only with the complicity of Congress have we become a Nation of preemptive war, secret military tribunals, torture, rejection of habeas corpus, warrantless searches, undue government secrecy, extraordinary renditions, and uncontrollable spying on the American people.

The greatest danger we face is ourselves, what we are doing in the name of providing security for a people made fearful by distortions of facts. Fighting over there has nothing to do with pre-

serving freedoms here at home. More likely, the opposite is true.

Surely we can do better than this supplemental authorization. I plan to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about our supplemental, the bill that will be before us on this Thursday for a vote.

It is very important that the American people understand what it is we are doing. We have no choice in the matter. Yes, we are Democrats. We are in the leadership, and we must move an appropriations bill that will, in fact, first and foremost support our troops.

There is a lot that has been said on the other side of the aisle about the motivations about all that is here.

□ 1900

But there is another factor to this, Mr. Speaker, and that is the American people. The American people went to the polls in November, and they put Democrats in charge. They are the bosses. The bosses made a change of leadership. It is incumbent upon us as Democrats to lead.

I want to make sure that the American people understand what is in this bill and why it is important. First of all, this bill fully supports our troops and especially our veterans in the need of health care. It ensures that U.S. forces in the field have all of the funds and resources they require. There is no cutting of funds in this bill.

It directs more resources to the war against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan, where the terrorists are, where the person is hiding who attacked this country on 9/11.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, the people of Iraq did not attack us. The people who attacked us are on the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan. That is where this bill is putting more funds.

It improves the health care for returning service members and veterans that is woefully neglected and has been woefully neglected under this administration. There is no question about it. The news items come out daily. All we need to look at is the situation at Walter Reed. This legislation stops the closure of Walter Reed Hospital and pours \$2.8 billion into veterans programs, more than has been done in recent times.

And, yes, it does what the majority of the American people want and begins to set a reasonable redeployment deadline schedule for us to come out of the civil war in Iraq so that we can better position ourselves to have a new Middle Eastern policy that reflects containment in that region and in a way that gets our young men and women out of the cross hairs of a civil war.

Let me just be specific, if I may, Mr. Speaker, on the health care. As I said, there is \$2.8 billion for defense health care, which is \$1.7 billion above what the President requested. It doesn't look like a cut to me.

Additional funds supporting new initiatives to enhance Medicaid services for Active Duty forces, to mobilized personnel and their family members, who have been woefully neglected.

This includes \$450 million for post-traumatic stress disorder counseling. The psychiatrists have said on more than one occasion that there is a policy of sending our young men and women back into harm's way before they are mentally healed. There is a different way to determine whether you are mentally healed. It is more difficult than a physical wound that you can see.

Four hundred fifty million dollars for traumatic brain injury care and research.

Mr. Speaker, I just left Landstuhl Medical Center near Ramstein Air Base 4 weeks ago, and I saw firsthand the injuries to our soldiers. I was there. I talked with them. It was my third trip into that base. When you go to Landstuhl, you are seeing the injuries right as they come from downrange in Afghanistan and Iraq. So you are right there where it is, and I saw the need. That is why we put \$730 million to prevent health care fee increases for our troops, \$20 million to address the problems at Walter Reed, and \$14 million in burn care.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is up. I just want to make sure the American people know the Democrats are putting forward a plan that is truly responsive to our troops and to our veterans.

#### THE VALUE OF THE AMERICAN SERVICE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke here in the well about our service economy. Accounting for nearly 80 percent of both our workforce and private sector gross domestic product, services actually form the backbone of our economy. These industries are thriving in the worldwide marketplace and are a major source of our global competitiveness. Our annual exports in services are approaching \$400 billion, and we have long had a trade surplus in this sector of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, one such source is the motion picture and television production industry. This industry is a thriving economic engine, creating well-paying jobs and economic benefits to communities all across America, not just in my State of California. In fact, with filming in 44 States, the motion picture and television production industry generates more than 1.3 million American jobs, \$30.24 billion in wages to American workers and \$30.2 billion in revenue every year. It is very competitive internationally, with a \$9.5 billion trade surplus. And it is the only industry, Mr. Speaker, it is our only industry in which we actually have a trade surplus with every single one of our trading partners.

Motion pictures and television production creates jobs in a wide range of fields, from the highly technical to the highly creative. But one thing they have in common is that they are largely based on the knowledge economy that provides the foundation for both our economic well-being and our comparative advantage in the global economy.

Another major services sector is the express delivery industry, Mr. Speaker. This is an industry that is not only thriving in the global economy, but it is actually making the global economy possible. In a world where just-in-time delivery is essential to doing business, where U.S. companies, large and small, can get raw materials from Chile, make products in Michigan and sell them in Korea, express delivery is obviously a very integral part of that economy.

Goods transported by air account for only 3 percent by weight of all goods traded globally, but 40 percent of value. That is 3 percent in weight, but 40 percent in value.

U.S. companies that ship worldwide are helping to grow our economy as they facilitate the interconnectedness of the world's producers and consumers. For example, Mr. Speaker, every time UPS adds 40 new international packages into its system, it creates a new job right here in the United States of America. Every day, in fact, UPS carries 8 percent of all U.S. gross domestic product and 3 percent of world global gross domestic product within its system. By tapping into the ever-growing need to ship worldwide, express delivery companies create new jobs here at home, facilitate economic growth around the globe and demonstrate that U.S. service companies are thriving in the worldwide marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the telecommunications industry is yet another example of American businesses that are both tapping into and facilitating a shrinking world that brings a globe-full of benefits and opportunities right to our doorstep here in the United States. U.S. telecom companies are extremely competitive in the global economy, with international revenues rising more than 12 percent in just the last

year. 2006 was the third year in a row with double-digit growth in international revenue. The global telecom market is projected to reach \$4.3 trillion by 2010. That is \$1.2 trillion in the United States, but \$3 trillion internationally.

Clearly, the competitiveness of the U.S. industry depends upon worldwide economic global engagement. At the same time, these services are making the world more and more connected, enabling producers, consumers and investors to communicate quickly and easily with every corner of the globe. And, as we have seen, our service providers thrive on this increased connectiveness. As global leaders, they are constantly creating new opportunities, here at home and around the globe, as they grow our economy and make the worldwide marketplace more and more accessible for everyone. And they have done so at a time when worldwide economic liberalization in services has been very limited.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue on a path towards greater economic freedom so that our service industries, the backbone of our economy, can achieve greater and greater success in the global marketplace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TRIBUTE TO LARRY CARROLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Larry Carroll on 30 years of outstanding service with the Permian Basin Community Centers.

Mr. Carroll represents the model public citizen. He has served the Permian Basin Community Center as director of finance, deputy executive director, and now as the center's executive director. I served on and chaired the board of directors for the PBCC and know Mr. Carroll to be one of the finest, most capable executive directors in the community center system.

It is his commitment, dedication and wisdom that has helped develop the center into one of the most outstanding community organizations the Permian Basin has to offer. Mr. Carroll has made a personal commitment to helping others through his additional valued work with the Rotary Club and Leadership Odessa, and I am proud to represent my friend in Congress.

The 11th District of Texas congratulates and graciously thanks Mr. Carroll for this milestone and his exemplary service to the community.

#### A WALK THROUGH THE CONSTITUTION: THE PREAMBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to announce a new series of weekly topics for the Congressional Constitution Caucus. I found that many Americans, including some of my fellow Members, are not as familiar with the Constitution as they might want to be.

Last Thursday this was demonstrated to us when three local schoolchildren, ages 8 to 12, came into the office. They were wearing these little "Liberty Day Kids" T-shirts and buttons, and they announced that they were going to door to door in the buildings asking congressional offices questions in honor of James Madison's birthday, questions such as what is necessary to override a Presidential veto, or where do all of the appropriations bills originate from.

Out of curiosity we asked them if most people had been answering the questions correctly, and the children emphatically shook their heads no. So tonight and each Tuesday after votes, we hope to help correct that problem by taking a walk through the Constitution, and I encourage other Members to join us as we educate each other and the Nation about our preeminent founding document.

So we begin by looking at the Preamble of the Constitution. It is perhaps one of most well-known sections, the Constitution's introductory sentence, which reads, "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

So this passage sums up in a condensed version what the Founders were intending in this document. So let's look at some of the phrases.

The first phrase, "We the People of the United States." Now, these words by themselves almost sound trite today, but they were groundbreaking pronouncements when they were written. You see, the previous document, the Articles of Confederation, was an agreement solely between the States, and other earlier documents, including the 1778 Treaty of Alliance with France and the 1783 Treaty of Paris did not even include the word "people."

In convincing Virginia to ratify the Constitution, the Governor explained to them why the word was appropriate. He said, "The government is for the people; and the misfortune was, that the people had no agency in the government before. If the government is to be binding on the people, are not the people the proper persons to examine its merits or defects?" The Constitution therefore binds America together.

The next phrase is "In order to form a more perfect Union." The Founders simply believed that the new government would be stronger than the one under the Articles of Confederation. You see, the loose confederation of States had led to bickering and ineffective government. But this new arrangement of States has allowed the States to retain their power, but also work together for the common good.

Thomas Jefferson wrote therefore, The union is the last anchor of our hope.

The third phrase is "to establish Justice."

□ 1915

This refers to a problem that had arisen in the State court systems. And so by creating a Supreme Court of the land, the Framers hoped to prevent egregious examples of trampled rights. But the Framers had a higher purpose in mind, too. In Federalist No. 51, James Madison wrote: "Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit."

The next section is to provide for the common defense. This phrase is perhaps the most evident today. See, the War for Independence had been fought for that very reason; and in the years following the war, our fledgling Nation had been unable to defend itself against the Barbary pirates and also from Spain and England threats. So the States realized they needed to unite to preserve the Union.

The next one is very important for today. The phrase "to promote the general welfare," this has been commonly interpreted to mean that the Federal Government can do almost anything as long as it accomplishes something beneficial. But you see, this definition ignores the Founders' real intent. See, they deliberately used qualifying words such as "general" because they meant to limit the powers rather than expand it. Think about it. Would it be proper and fair for the Federal Government to recognize certain groups over other ones, certain States over others? If the Founding Fathers didn't intend to create these special rights or special privileges or socioeconomic programs, there would not have been any reason to list the specific powers that are listed in the Constitution.

James Madison even stated that the "general welfare" clause was not intended to give Congress an open hand "to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defense or general welfare."

The final section reads "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." These words come from the previous phrase, for without law, it is impossible to achieve liberty for future generations.

I will close by saying we look forward each week to come to the floor on Tuesdays as we walk through the Constitution week after week to better un-

derstand this important document for this House and for this country.

#### RURAL VETERANS ACCESS TO CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as many in this House of Representatives know, I represent one of the largest congressional districts in this country of over 53,000 square miles. The district is about the size of the State of Illinois. It is bigger than 25 of 26 States east of the Mississippi River. It has more hospitals than any other congressional district, but it has no Veterans Administration Hospital.

Some veterans in my rural district have experienced great difficulty in traveling to distant VA health facilities to access care. Though we have been successful in opening several VA outpatient clinics in the First Congressional District, access to care remains a real challenge for veterans living in rural Kansas.

I would like to share a couple of stories from Kansans who have written me recently. I received the following letter from the wife of a World War II veteran: "My husband and I have been residents of a long-term care facility for 2 years, and he is unable to travel 65 miles to take a physical at the Hays Kansas VA clinic, as is required by the VA to receive prescription benefits. They have stopped filling his prescription medicine. Veterans like Ralph gave several years of their lives for our country, and I feel it is a very ungrateful way to treat them."

The second case involves an elderly veteran from Hoxie, Kansas, who is in need of a pair of glasses. This veteran was told he must travel over 4 hours to the Wichita VA Hospital to get a new pair of glasses, a distance of about 260 miles, and it doesn't make sense to him because his community's optometrist is just across the street.

No, it doesn't make sense to any of us. Lack of access to VA care is a problem felt around the country by veterans living in rural America. Veterans who live in rural America are one in five of the veterans enrolled in the health care system. Rural veterans face unique challenges like long drives to VA facilities, bad weather, and lack of specialists. Limited access to VA care too often means rural veterans simply forgo the care and treatment they need. Studies have found that rural veterans are in poorer health than their urban counterparts. A policy change is needed. It isn't right to penalize some veterans because of where they live. It is time to provide these veterans the health care benefits they have earned and that have been promised to them.

I have introduced the Rural Veterans Access to Care Act with the goal of ending these disparities in access. This

legislation requires the VA to contract with qualified outside health providers to give our most underserved veterans more options to receive care. Rather than traveling long distances to reach VA facilities or deciding not to make the trip at all, these veterans would be given the choice to receive care closer to home at their local hospital or their community clinic or their local physician's office. Additionally, the VA would be required to fill prescriptions written by outside doctors to eligible veterans.

To meet the needs of highly rural veterans, the VA would contract and partner with community physicians as well as local hospitals, community health centers, and rural health clinics. These providers already supply high-quality care to America's rural population, and yet their services are denied to America's veterans.

Since our Nation's founding, rural communities have always responded to the Nation's call. Today, 44 percent of our country's military recruits come from rural America. When these rural soldiers return home from war, our Nation must be prepared to care for them. Let's take advantage of the successes of existing rural health infrastructure in order to meet the unmet needs of America's rural veterans.

For our elderly World War II veterans, our young soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, and those who served in all of the conflicts in between, this is a commonsense and life-saving approach that our Nation owes its rural veterans.

#### AMERICA CANNOT REPEAT MISTAKE OF 1938

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1938 domestic needs were great in this country. The New Deal programs that FDR had actually failed, and the Depression had deepened during his second term to the point that the P-51 fighter plane was considered so insignificant and so costly it was not funded that year.

When World War II started, the bombing runs that we took as a country produced 20 percent casualties for us to the point that we suspended bombing runs until we could build enough P-51 fighters to accompany them. It was not until the winter of 1943 that we were able to have superiority over the sky in Europe.

The technology of today has made this world so much smaller and so much faster that we cannot afford to make the same mistake this country did in 1938. We cannot predict the type of future combat we will be called upon to participate in. We must be prepared for that future.

Decisions we make today, because basically it takes 8 years from design to construction of a plane, decisions we

make today have the impact of what kind of options we have both in the military and diplomatic sphere 10 and 15 years from now.

This country has controlled the skies since the Korean War, and we take it for granted. We have forgotten that we have flown a military sortie every day of every year for the past 16 years, and we have done so with the oldest fleet in the history of this country. Our newest plane, the F-16, is 30 years old. It is older than the pilots who fly it. There are F-16s at this time that are restricted as to the speed and the distance in which they can fly. We have 63 C-130 cargo planes that cannot fly if they actually have any cargo. We have KC-135s that generals in the field will not accept because the age of the plane makes it impossible to protect.

Despite our best efforts at our depots to try and fix these planes and patch them up, we cannot ignore the reality and forget we are in a difficult situation with the capacity of our military equipment. It may take, indeed, a catastrophe, the wings falling off, until we recognize the situation we are in, or find ourselves short-handed in a time of need.

The Air Force has asked for the ability of recapitalization, taking 1,000 planes they have determined to be excess and no longer funding those planes and instead putting that money into new technology. This Congress has failed to allow them to do so on many of those planes.

If we had sufficient F-22s, we could get rid of all of our F-117s and save this country over a billion dollars a year over a 5-year period of time.

While we have been playing around in America, our enemies, our allies, and maybe those who in the future will become our enemies have not been sitting still. The Chinese have added 10 percent to their military budget every year since 1990. That is a 200 percent increase over the past 17 years. Their navy is expanding. Their medium-range missiles are expanding. In January, they conducted a test to shoot down one of their own satellites which is the same type we depend upon for communications in the United States. And more significantly, their Jian-10 is a sleek new fighter aircraft designed to narrow the gap between the Chinese and the American Air Force to give them numerical compatibility and technical equality to the United States Air Force.

The Russians have a new Sukov fighter airplane that they have already fielded which is technologically equal to what we have.

We have even found a Third World country like the Indian Air Force has put so much money into their technology and training of their pilots that in many respects they are equal to the United States.

We cannot afford to wait for the future. This country needs to build the fifth generation of fighters, the F-22. We need all 183. Actually, we need 300,

not just the 183 we have authorized. We need to put money directly into the new F-35s. That is the future: 1,500 planes for both the Navy, the Marines and the Air Force to be the next generation to give us technological superiority in the skies and maintain superiority in the skies into the next decade.

If we do not do that, we are desperately playing and gambling with our own future. We forget how long it took to ramp up to be producing the F-16s we fly today. This country should be producing 200 planes a year. Instead, in our budget for next year, we have scheduled to produce six, and two in the supplemental that were taken out. We are gambling with the future of this country because we have taken the past for granted.

In fact, as one general half jokingly said, if we are not willing to appropriate the money to let our Air Force build the new equipment and planes they need, maybe we should at least give them the opportunity to purchase the Russian planes so they can be flying something that is new.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot gamble with the future of this country. We cannot make the same mistakes we did in 1938. We need to put money into the building of the F-22 and the F-35 for the future of this Air Force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KING of Iowa addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. I am glad to see you there in the Chair. Also, I am glad to be joined by Mr. MURPHY and also Mr. RYAN. We are pleased Mr. RYAN can be here at the top of the 30-Something Working Group hour.

We come to the floor every week, sometimes two or three times a week, to talk about the great things that are happening here in the House, talk about how we are getting better not only as to oversight but appropriations, and also budgeting, making sure that we budget so we no longer have to borrow money from foreign nations.

The discussion here tonight is important because we have the emergency

war supplemental that is coming to the floor on Thursday. The Appropriations Committee dealt with that today. To have such an important Member like Mr. RYAN who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, they have been doing quite a bit of work. I know he has a lot to share with us making sure that we sling-shot the troops in for a win, and also the folks who have served our country, the men and women who have served our country in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note there is \$1.7 billion in this bill for health care; it is \$1.7 billion more than the President has asked for. Also as relates to veterans health care, there is \$1.7 billion more than what the President requested.

We had a chart on the floor last week that talked about Democrats when we were in the minority putting forth proposals to make sure that our veterans had what they needed once they left Afghanistan and Iraq, and even for those still in the service.

We have also put additional dollars in as relates to readiness, and we will talk about that because we have some definitions we want to share with Members.

But since Mr. RYAN has been spending a lot of time in the Appropriations Committee working on these very issues, I thought I would yield to my good friend and allow him to elaborate on the very work they have been doing over the last couple of weeks. I said before you came in, Mr. RYAN, that we are so happy you are here at the top of the 30-Something Working Group hour because you are an appropriator and that is an important position.

□ 1930

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, and no more important than the Ways and Means Committee, of which you serve on, and all your hard work over the past 4 years in the United States Congress, previous to that in the Florida Senate, previous to that in the Florida House, following in your mom's footsteps, who was also an appropriator in the United States Congress. So it is an honor to follow in her footsteps.

I think there is a couple of very important points that we want to make in regards to this bill that we have before us on Thursday. It passed out of the Appropriations Committee last Thursday, and this, in essence, in fact, in reality, is the piece of legislation that will help change the course of our Iraq policy.

The President has had free rein for the past 5 years from a Republican Congress that just went along with everything that he wanted to do, and I found it funny this weekend, as we were watching some of the weekend shows, and I was watching Meet the Press and former Congressman Tom DeLay was on, Richard Perle, one of the top, President's top defense advisers was on, and they were arguing that

if we pull out of Iraq, that somehow the sky's going to fall, okay, and that this whole thing, that Iraq is going to turn into a catastrophe, and it is going to fall apart; it is going to spin out of control.

I just could not help but to think that these people, Mr. Speaker, have absolutely no credibility to comment on what is going on in Iraq. They can talk and they can say what they need to say, but the bottom line is they have expressed their opinion over the past 5 years, and it is difficult to find any statements that they have made that have been either factual or predictions that they have made that came true.

I want to say a couple of things about this bill that we are going to pass.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Please say it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are saying basically and General Petraeus is saying this. Now they are saying that we are going to need until summer to figure out whether or not the surge is working. In our bill that we are passing, that we are going to pass on Thursday, it says by July 1, which is the summer, that if by July 1 there is no progress being made, that we immediately begin to withdraw our troops down in 180 days; and if by October 1 the President does not certify that the benchmarks that he came up with are met, we begin to get out of there; and at the absolute latest, we start withdrawing March of next year and have everybody home by August of 2008.

Here is what I want to say, because here is the big argument that we had. We are saying that there are benchmarks that they need to meet, and if they do not meet them, they are deadlines, and we are coming home. What we are hearing from the other side is that you cannot have benchmarks, you cannot possibly have any benchmarks, you cannot tie the President's hands. Well, actually, it is funny.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. When did you pass this legislation? I mean, pass it out of Appropriations Committee, when did that happen?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thursday it passed out of committee.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That just happened. That just happened.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. On Thursday?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right, and now all our friends on the other side are saying, you cannot possibly set a deadline, you cannot possibly tie the President's hands. Very interesting when you go back and do a little research.

In June of 1997, when our troops were on their way to Bosnia under President Clinton, House Republicans brought to the floor an amendment that would, guess what, set a timeline and a date certain for withdrawal from the U.S. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, a mission that was only 18 months old. So all of the Republicans who say that we cannot possibly be for a timeline were for a timeline 10 years ago in Bosnia.

Now, our friend from Indiana Mr. BUYER, who we had a nice debate with over the resolution a few weeks ago, offered an amendment that by December 15, 1997, President Clinton was required to report to Congress on political and military conditions in Bosnia. By June 30 of 1998, all troops had to be withdrawn. That was an amendment that the now-ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs offered in 1997, and you will never guess all of the Republicans, members of leadership today, who voted for that amendment, and now all of the sudden they are saying, you cannot possibly be for a timeline or a date certain, and on and on and on.

We will continue to go through this debate. This will be the debate the next couple of weeks, but the Republicans in 1997, some of the top leaders in Congress today, supported a date certain that we would come out of Bosnia, withdraw the troops, and that was only 18 months into Bosnia and only \$7 billion, and here we are today, 48 months, \$379 billion, and over 3,200 American lives.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We are within our fifth year now, our fifth year, and Mr. Speaker, I always say there is nothing like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is the reason why the 30-something Working Group, we like third-party validators, and we love the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because that is the reason why we meet. That is the reason why we make sure we have what we need to have to give good, accurate information to the Members.

But we have a very important Member that is on the floor that is a member of not only the Financial Services Committee, but also Government Oversight, that has their work cut out as it relates to making sure that this government is efficient, and that is Mr. MURPHY. I think that it is very important that we hear from him and some of the information that he has to share, because a lot of the information we have now is from Mr. MURPHY's committee.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Appropriations Committee is a very important place, Ways and Means is very important.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are all important.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We are all important in our own ways.

Government Oversight and Reform, though, that was a committee that was a little sleepy here for the last few years. I have not been here with you for the last few years, but I was a watcher. I think I could see what was happening down here in C-SPAN. You did not see many oversight hearings. You did not see a lot from the Armed Services Committee, the Government Oversight Committee exercising what used to be the constitutional prerogative of the coequal branch, which is the legislative branch.

Here is how things have changed. Let me put this where people can see it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Nothing like a good chart.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I want to display an important number here: 104. I will tell you why that number matters. That is the hearings on issues related to the Iraq War just this year; 104 different hearings have been held.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Those just happened.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. That just happened.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Another thing that is so very, very important, is his name David Broder, the conservative writer? I was home reading a hometown paper. Some folks in this town admit that they do not read the paper, but I do, and he wrote an article saying no blank checks out of this Congress, and it talked about oversight hearings and talked about what is happening in Justice, Mr. Speaker, and it talked about what is happening in some of the other Federal agencies. But he ended the article by saying it really does not change government. It does. This is where he is wrong. It does.

Half of the things that we know now about Walter Reed, most of the things that we know now about the Iraq war is that the Congress is now carrying out its constitutional responsibility, and that is to have oversight. So I just wanted to, just if we continue like Mr. RYAN was saying, listening to these voices of the past, saying let us stay in the same direction, oh, do not worry about having oversight hearings, where were these voices when folks were giving away millions of dollars in special interest tax cuts to the superwealthy and to the superconnected? So I think it is important we are on the right track.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It used to be that, you are right, it was 60 Minutes and New York Times and The New Yorker. That was the oversight branch in our Federal Government. It was the press. We are thankful that they actually brought some things to light.

But what we have learned just in the first 2 months, what we have brought out in these oversight hearings are really stunning to the American people. Nine billion dollars put out in cash on wooden pallets, thrown out of SUVs in sacks as they drove down the street, unaccounted for, do not know where it went, have no idea where it went.

We have got Blackwater, a contractor out there, keeping the diplomats and some American military personnel safe. Well, we find out that the government's role in overseeing Blackwater and a lot of these other contractors, you know what we did? We contracted that out, too. We contracted that out, too. Blackwater took its responsibility and contracted somebody else, and they contracted somebody else. Everybody made a dime along the way. These were things that you did not hear about in these halls until we got here.

So the bill that you outlined, it does the right thing for our troops. It does

the right thing for our veterans. There are some other pieces that we can talk about, how it does the right thing for kids, the right things for farmers, but also does the right thing for taxpayers because it finally gives some accountability in how we spend these dollars. We would like to see an end to these dollars. But while we are spending money, at least finally we are going to have some accountability for those dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The President has to deal with Congress now, and what is in this bill I think holds the President accountable. This bill does not just hold the Iraqis accountable, but it holds the President accountable.

The benchmarks that are in this supplement that we are going to pass are the President's benchmarks that he outlined in January that we need to hit. Now, if we do not hit them, then what do we do? The President says, do not tie my hands. We are saying, these are your benchmarks. We have been there for a long time, and if they do not step up, the Iraqi troops do not step up, it is time for us to go.

The bottom line is that there is no incentive for the Iraqis to step up because at this point they feel like we will stay there forever, and we are saying that we are not going to be there forever; get your act together.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I think it is important, as we start to look at this, I cannot help but reflect on the fact that as of 10 a.m. today, and that is today, that we have lost 3,222 men and women in Iraq. I mean, that is not a small number when we look at the sacrifices that have been made. Also, we are looking at another 13,415 wounded that have returned to duty, and 10,722 wounded that cannot return to duty. Then we have folks that are whining about having some accountability in what we now call 5 years later emergency supplemental funding.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for the Members to understand because we want to come to the floor, we do not want a Member going back to their district saying they did not understand what was in the bill because we know it is on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN pointed that out we have some folks that are just going to vote on principle; I am going to vote against this because it was not my idea. I am going to vote against it because I am a Republican. Well, guess what? The American people voted last November for leadership, not saying that I am going to send a Democrat or Republican. We had Republicans that were tenured in this House, served 10-, 15-year terms unelected because they were following partisan politics. It is very, very important that we look at the bipartisanship in this.

I will yield because I was about to make a point on the readiness issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Because I have to take off a few minutes early, and I want to go through real quick, I want to talk about what these folks who say

they are going to vote against this bill, what they are voting against from the veterans' standpoint, okay.

Now, these are folks who consistently say, Mr. Speaker, we support the troops, work for the troops. We have got to get the troops back. I think we all believe that, but there will be an opportunity on Thursday to really put your voting card where all the rhetoric is.

Defense health care, we add \$1.7 billion of an increase to the President's request. Here is what you are voting against if you vote against the supplemental. You are voting against an additional \$450 million for post-traumatic stress disorder and counseling.

You are going to vote against \$450 million for traumatic brain injury care and research, and if you have been to Walter Reed, as we all have, you will see unbelievable brain injuries.

You will be voting against \$730 million to prevent health care fee increases for our troops.

You are going to vote against \$20 million to address the problem at Walter Reed, and you are going to vote against \$14.8 million for burn care.

Now, that is just defense health care. Now veterans health care. Now, we have got to support these veterans coming back; an additional \$1.7 billion above the President's request for veterans health care.

If you vote against this supplemental, here is what you are voting against.

□ 1945

You are voting against \$550 million to address the backlog in maintaining VA health care facilities. You will vote against \$250 million for medical administration to ensure there is sufficient personnel to support the growing number of Iraqi and Afghanistan troops coming back. That was the major problem at Walter Reed because of the contracting issue, because some people had to make some money on the deal; \$229 million for treating the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. It is a growing number, \$100 million for contract mental health care and \$62 million to help speed up the process.

Now, there are other things in here. We are going to talk about readiness.

But if you vote against this, that is what you are voting against. I would hate to see the political commercials that may be run if you are on the other end of this thing.

I mean, that is just, I wouldn't want to be in that position, but that is what is in the bill. So rhetoric is rhetoric, action is action, and it is \$1.7 billion more for defense health care, \$1.7 billion more for veterans health care.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Before Mr. MEEK talks about readiness, let me just make one more point on top of that. It seemed that for years this Congress, the Republicans who set the policy for this war, didn't view the cost of the war as including taking care of the soldiers when they came back from

Iraq and Afghanistan, that the cost of the war was just the money for the Humvees and the salaries and the missiles and the rifles. No, the cost of the war is all of what it takes to actually conduct that war on the battlefield, but it also is about putting forth every single dollar that is necessary to take care of those brave men and women when they come back to the United States.

Now, used to be in World War I, World War II, wars in the middle of the century that you would have about three injured soldiers for every soldier that was killed in action. Now, with improvements in technology in armor and medicine, we now have a 16-1 ratio. That is great news. That is great news, more people are coming back alive, but they are coming back with more difficult injuries, more complex medical issues. We haven't built into that war the cost of taking care of those veterans.

That is what this bill does. That is what this bill does. It is going to fund the withdrawal. It will fund the redeployment of our forces to fights that we still can win. It will also for the first time, for the first time, recognize that the cost of the war includes taking care of the veterans, not just average health care. In fact, we found out in many cases, in Walter Reed substandard health care, but with gold standard health care. Our veterans system should be the best health care available in this country.

With \$1.7 billion in defense health care, \$1.7 new dollars for veterans health care, we will finally live up to that commitment to our veterans and our soldiers when they get back here, like we should when they are over fighting for us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I think it is important for us to look at the following line. This bill puts also enforcement behind what is already out there. There is no policy risk here in this bill. We know that the Iraq Study Group says that we should have timelines. That is in this bill.

We know that the military, as it relates to readiness, and we know that there are four basic components to readiness, you have, for instance, we have 100 Striker brigades that are in our military right now. We know in every Striker vehicle you have to have a commander, a gunner and a driver. We need to make sure that we have all three of those components before we send a Striker force into Iraq or Afghanistan. That is in this bill, and that is what the military calls for.

I think it is important to also outline that there is not a National Guard unit that is right now in our National Guard force that is combat ready. Right now, I say that with great confidence. We don't have that right now. I am on the Armed Services Committee because I know this stuff. I mean, I know this stuff because we talk about it.

We talk about the fact that we are not ready to do the things that we need



to do as it relates to equipment maintenance. In many parts of the theater we don't have what we need to keep heavy vehicles moving. We look at the reason why we don't have up-armored vehicles, in some instance, going out on patrol. If you ask some here in Washington DC, that is every time, but not all the time.

In Baghdad, this is very, very important, the training and making sure that everyone is trained and have what they need to have to carry out the task within a brigade is very, very important.

In this supplemental we are meeting the needs of the Army as it relates to what they need. I think it's 36,000 troops, additional troops. They need an Army, and we are also increasing the Marines by three brigades, if Members want to vote against this piece of legislation.

I think it's also good to outline in 2001, we were at 80 percent of readiness. When we say "readiness," everyone was trained and equipment was in place to be able to deal with it. We haven't been down at the numbers or the level we are now as it relates to readiness or a lack thereof since the end of the Vietnam War.

In this day and time when we have Iran and we have Syria and we have North Korea and we have other countries of interest to the United States as it relates to a threat, now more than ever we need to make sure that we are there not only for the troops but also for the American people.

I think it is also important to shed light on the fact that there are several other great things that are in this bill, \$2.6 billion to deal with Homeland Security issues that were not dealt with, Hurricane Katrina relief, \$2.9 billion, also as it relates to urgent State children's health care and insurance needs at \$750 million, urgent needs for pandemic flu preparedness at \$1 billion.

As we start to look at and uncover in these hearings, as some talk about, that are a waste of time, we start looking at the gaps of the lack of oversight and a lack of execution on behalf of programs and initiatives that will make our troops' lives better, those that are enlisted, those that are Reservists, to be able to secure our troops that are in theater at this time, many of whom are in the areas of great danger and constant fire, and also looking at the needs of the country, of the everyday American people.

Now, it is interesting because the minority side, the Republicans over there, when we start looking at some of them, when we start looking at some of these votes that have taken place, many of the Members of the leadership, if not all, have voted against commonsense legislation that we passed on a bipartisan basis.

I mean, we had a number of Republicans voting for bills that were brought up by this Democratic Congress. You look at implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, we

had 299 votes, Democrats voted in the affirmative, we had 299 overall votes, 86 of those individuals were Republicans. Minimum wage, to be able to raise minimum wage, 315 with 82 Republicans joining us.

Also, you have funding enhancement for stem cell research, 253, and a majority of Members voted for that bill. Thirty-seven Republicans joined us making prescription drugs affordable for seniors. H.R. 4, 255, it passed with 24 Republicans joining us. Cutting the student loan interest rates in half, H.R. 5, 356, with 124 Republicans joining us.

Again, creating long-term energy initiatives, H.R. 6 passed, 264, with 36 Republicans joining us.

Now, I can tell you tomorrow or Thursday, there will be a number of individuals thinking about how they are going to vote. But I can tell you this, there are several things that we can say about this emergency supplemental that is really, really good for the country, and there are also eight or nine points that I can point out that are leadership calls. You have to be a leader to take a position on anything, and I think we have some Members on the minority side that don't want to take a position.

Let me go back to David Broder's article that he wrote, and the Members can get it at [miamiherald.com](http://miamiherald.com); it was March 18. It should still be on, you can get it for free on the World Wide Web: "Congress won't sign any more blank checks," but it goes on down to paragraph 6 and talks about the fact that for 6 years the Bush administration and the aids that they are talking about earlier in the bill would have free rein on carrying out whatever political policy or assignment they wished, and also the President. Let's just say hypothetically, that the President wanted this done.

A Congress, under a firm Republican control, was solemn when it came down to oversight of the executive branch. No Republican committee chairman wanted to turn rocks over as it relates to the Republican administration.

I think it's important that we have the kind of forward lean that we have now, because that is what the American people have called for. They asked for accountability. They asked for oversight. They asked for Members of Congress to come here and be Members of Congress, not just say Mr. MURPHY is my friend, and we all get along and I see him in the hall, he wears nice ties, what have you, is a member of Financial Services and also Government Oversight.

They didn't send us here to have great relationships and to slap each other in the back. They sent us here to provide the kind of leadership that they deserve. The bottom line is, when that bill and this emergency supplemental bill comes up, war supplemental comes up on the floor, we will have to take a position. We have to answer for the fact that we have put benchmarks in this bill saying that the

Iraqi Government, their feet have to be held to the fire, because, guess what, back in my district there are mayors and there are county commissioners and there are city commissioners and there are school board commissioners and there are constituents of mine that want health care, and their feet are being held to the fire. Mayors have to fill out more paperwork. I guarantee you the mayor of Baghdad has to fill them out too as it relates to Federal dollars.

You talked about in the early days of voting money on the back of a truck and passing out cash money to pay government workers in Iraq and to do other things that we know very little about now. We also know that weapons that we bought are unaccounted for at this time.

To say that we are the so-called board of the United States of America, and the President is the chief CEO, the chief executive officer, we are not carrying out our responsibilities, making sure that the President does exactly what he said he would do, making sure that Iraqi government does what they said they would do. We need to make sure that our men and women don't have to speak under their breath as it relates to readiness, as they board a plane to go to Kuwait to then be shipped to Iraq, that they don't have what they need in a Striker brigade, that they don't have what they need as it relates to the training or the equipment or the down time that they deserve, not a rotation based on some bureaucrat in Washington DC saying, well, we need three more brigades in Iraq.

Oh, well, I know they have only been home for 120 days, but we need them there to keep up our troop level there at over 147,000. I must add, where other countries have announced or have withdrawn, we have replaced them with American troops. Yes, this is a leadership vote, and, yes, some of us are going to have to go to the wizard and get some courage and come here and vote on behalf of the supplemental.

Now, I respect folks having different opinions, but this is a far better supplemental bill than Members in this Congress have voted on in the past. We have voted on at least two of them since I have been here. I can remember two of them, and they did not have benchmarks. They just had money in the bill saying trust the President and trust the Department of Defense, they know what they are doing.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Blank checks.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Guess what, the American people have said, I don't like that. I don't want to do that any more.

So now we have the opportunity to put the language in the bill that would hopefully get us to the point where the Iraqi Government will say, wow, the U.S. Government is no longer playing around with us. The American people are no longer playing around with us.

We will actually have to perform. We will actually have to turn out the troops and keep the retention as it relates to our security forces and to secure our own country. We are not going to be there forever. We are going to make sure of that.

For those that are saying we have to be there as long as we have to be there, I am saying that there has to be benchmarks. I am saying \$500 billion has been spent in this war thus far and will continue to be spent unless someone stands up and takes the responsibility on.

I commend the Speaker, commend the leadership, commend every Member that has put their shoulder to the wheel and said this must be done now, not next year, not 3 years from now, not maybe we will think about it one day. The bottom line is there are folks here saying we don't want to let down Iraqi people but, guess what, I don't want to let down a U.S. taxpayer.

I don't want to let down that individual that is sitting in a veterans hospital now hoping and wishing they could get the kind of good care if the Congress was to stand behind them. It's not a gift issue as it relates to the majority here in this House. It is when we vote on this bill Thursday they will be able to see the accountability they deserve. We have a process, get it through to the President.

This President can go on and on about how he will veto it, but I remember all of the tough talk. I have gone to the White House; I have spoken to the President. I don't have to talk in third party. I have done that. I don't have to have someone tell me what the President said.

□ 2000

The President said, even in his speech as it relates to the escalation of troops, well, we know that the people know that, yes, they are passing a non-binding resolution now. It is non-binding, but there will be a binding resolution as it relates to the emergency supplemental. And I agree with the President; yes, it was nonbinding, and, yes, we had a vote. And I told the President that bill will pass overwhelmingly against your initiative and escalation of troops in Iraq. He said, yes, KENDRICK, I do know that will happen, but there will be a binding resolution. And this is the binding resolution. And if the President wants a blank check, he is just not going to get it. And he has to come through this House of Representatives, he has to go through the Senate. And it is something we have to hold this government's feet to the fire, the Iraqi Government's feet to the fire, or you might as well start going back home, Members, and sharing with your constituents, how old is your son? Oh, he's 12? Well, he is going to be going to Iraq one day, and he is going to do it because it is going to continue to go on and on and on if we keep following the Bush philosophy.

And there is nothing wrong with our volunteer force. We have some individuals that graduated from high school and want to go into the Army. I am all for that. I help recruit on behalf of armed services. But I think it is important that we do not give our men and women a fixed deck because we weren't man enough and woman enough and leader enough to vote on their behalf for their accountability measures so they will have what they need when they go into theater.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, I can't match your level of articulateness, but I think you are saying what people feel out there. I mean, this election had to mean something. I mean, people spoke, they went out there in numbers in parts of the country that we haven't seen in a long time. And they spoke with a pretty loud voice that they wanted a different course of direction in Iraq.

Now let me read something somebody said a few years ago in 1997. Mr. RYAN, when he was joining us here, talked about the fact that there is a little bit of double talk this week from folks on the other side of the aisle, this idea that Congress really needs to back off and let the President do his business. Well, that wasn't the line coming out of here in 1997, when Congress thought something very different about the oversight responsibility of this body when it came to the effort in Bosnia.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee at that time was a gentleman named Floyd Spence from South Carolina. Here is what he said. This is his floor statement supporting the bill that was going to withdraw funding essentially from the President's intervention in Bosnia. He said, today's vote will call for the withdrawal of U.S. ground troops from a peacekeeping operation of growing expense and seeming unending duration. Mr. RYAN already told us that if that was unending duration, well, then you haven't seen unending duration compared to this effort. He went on to say, the time is long overdue for Congress to express its will on behalf of the American people. It is important that the Clinton administration be held accountable for the Nation's foreign policy and, in this case, for Bosnia policy. Let me say it again. It is long overdue for Congress to express its will on behalf of the American people.

You know what? I agree. That is what we are sent here to do. We are sent to invoke on this floor the will of the American people. That is why we get elected every 2 years instead of every 6 years, because we are the body here, the House of Representatives, and I have only been here for a couple of months, but I have studied enough history to understand that my responsibility when I came here was to speak on behalf of my constituents. And my constituents and the constituents of those that sent new Members here in droves from all over the country, from the Midwest to South, the Sun Belt,

the West and the Northeast, said, set a new course. Stand up to the President. Redeploy our forces for fights that still matter. Protect us at home. That is the will of the American people. That is what we are going to be talking about this week.

Mr. MEEK, I think elections mean something. And I think what we are going to engage in on Thursday is an effort to put the will of the American people into practice here.

Now, it is not just the American people. We just saw a poll the other day that came out and asked specifically whether the American people would support Congress' plan to bring American forces back home and redeploy them to other fights across the globe that we can still win by the fall of 2008, the bill that we are about to vote on this week, and it wasn't even close. A margin of over 20 percent, 59 percent to 34 percent of Americans support that plan. The American people said what they wanted on election day. And when pollsters went to just double-check the temperature and make sure they still thought that, well, they still think that, in fact, probably in greater numbers than they did on election day, seeing that things have only gotten worse on the ground and the President's policy has only become more meandering.

But we don't just have to listen to the American people, because we can also listen to our foreign policy community. We put on that Iraq Study Group some of the brightest minds in American foreign policy. The folks that have set the direction for foreign policy coming out of Washington for years all got together, Republicans and Democrats, folks that probably hadn't agreed on much of anything if you were to poll them on other foreign conflicts. Well, they all came to an agreement, and they sent a report to us saying it is time to set a new direction, it is time to start redeploying forces in 2008.

We can also listen to our military leaders as well. And we have read a lot of quotes on this floor, so we won't belabor it, but just take one. The Deputy Commander of Multinational Forces in Iraq said it very simply: It's clear, you cannot solve this problem militarily. You have to do it with a combination of military, economic and diplomatic things that we have to do.

The American public, our foreign policy community, military leaders on the ground who see this on a day-to-day basis say the same thing: We have put our men and women in the middle of a civil war. We have done virtually nothing to address the underlying causes of that religious conflict. And to simply allow them to continue to be the referee in an increasingly bloody battle, that is not the right policy for our troops, it is not the right policy for this country, and it is time to start focusing on real security issues again.

Let me bring up one last thing, Mr. MEEK, before I yield back, what is included in this bill. This isn't just about, you hear this word withdrawal,

this isn't about withdrawal. This is about focusing our efforts as a Nation on the fights that matter. We still have a real important conflict in Afghanistan. If we redirect some efforts there, we can still make a difference on the ground. Remember, that is where the people that attacked this country trained. That is where they base their operations. And if we are not careful, Afghanistan is going to fall right back into the hands of the folks who provided cover for so long to Osama bin Laden and his henchmen.

We also have to do a lot more here on the ground in our own country, Mr. MEEK. Now, you voted for efforts on the Democratic minority for years to try to bring light upon the fact that we have been spending billions of dollars over in Iraq. We haven't been spending money here at home to do the things we need to do to protect this Nation.

So this bill is going to put \$2.6 billion into homeland security needs, make sure that you and me and our families and our friends are protected here; \$2.6 billion, Mr. MEEK; \$1.25 billion for aviation security, including 1 billion for a new explosive detection system, \$90 million to deploy advanced checkpoint explosive detection equipment and screening techniques, \$160 million to do better when we are screening air cargo, \$1.25 billion for new port and transit and border security features, \$150 million for nuclear security, including, at the President's request, \$67 million to secure the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union.

Here is where the fight is; it is in places like Afghanistan, it is at our ports, it is on our borders. That is the fight that we are going to engage in. That is where we are going to refocus our efforts.

This vote that is coming up this week is about doing just what the Republicans told us we were supposed to do in 1997; that is, expressing the will of the American people on this floor. This vote is about putting our forces, putting our money where the fights matter most.

Mr. MEEK, I am going to be proud to be part of that this week when we finally get that chance to make the will of the American people the law of this country.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. MURPHY, it is so refreshing to hear you speak about this legislation, especially being fresh off the campaign trail, especially being a new Member of Congress. And I can tell you that as long as you continue to keep that spirit, and Members of this House and the majority continue to keep the spirit of wanting to do everything that you said you would do on the night that you were elected.

You know, many of us gave these great speeches, Mr. Speaker, talking about when we get to Washington, this is what we will do, and that I am going to be there for you, and that I am going to make sure that you get the kind of accountability that you deserve. I am

going to make sure that your tax dollars are being spent in an appropriate way. I am going to make sure that we take care of the troops. I am going to make sure that we hold this administration accountable. And then many times in the past, not this time fortunately, but many times in the past, a Member gets here to Washington, DC, starts walking around the Halls of Congress; a couple of folks call you Congressman or Congresswoman, you have a parking space downstairs. You know, folks, military folks, salute you when you get off a plane. You travel over into a foreign land, and in a motorcade going down the street, and then you forget about all those things. And I am so glad, Mr. MURPHY, that you have that spirit still in your heart. And there are a number of Members of Congress who still have that spirit.

And, Mr. Speaker, the reason why sometimes I get a little animated and a little excited about the fact that we have some Members here in the House who are willing to be followers when it is time for them to be leaders, and to take a position on anything, it doesn't matter what it may be; if it is changing, you know, the color of the paint in your office, it takes leadership to be able to do that because you have to stand behind that decision.

The decision saying that we want to make sure that the readiness level of our troops before they are put into harm's way is an important decision to be made and a decision that has been endorsed by the Defense Department. This is not new language, this is not a new idea, this is something that has to be placed into this supplemental to make sure the Defense Department does exactly what they said they would do in their own policy. We are not putting forth any new benchmarks for the Iraqi Government; this is what the President said. This is what he said, this is what came out of his mouth, that they have to meet these benchmarks, or we will no longer continue to do the things we have been doing. So that is the reason why it is in writing.

It is almost like when you talk to someone on the phone, and you have a health care crisis, and you call down to the hospital and you say, listen, I have a problem, I need you to help me out. You are talking to a person on the phone. First of all, you may say, can I have your name, please; who am I speaking with? Or another example: If I'm looking for financing for my house, and I am talking to someone on the phone, and they say, yes, sure, we can give you a very low interest rate, a 3.2 percent interest rate. Hey, can you give me that in writing?

What we are doing here in this emergency supplemental is we are giving the American people and our men and women in harm's way a supplemental in writing. It is not a speech. We are not talking to the Kiwanis Club, even though we have great Kiwanis Clubs out there, don't get me wrong. We are not at a Rotary luncheon giving those

speeches back home saying, "I love the troops, I love the troops." We are putting it in writing. We are not saying we love the veterans, when the veterans come up here to look at this great Capitol and see the flags flying over the House Chamber and over the Senate and over the dome of the Capitol and over the office buildings and all, proud to be an American, proud that they had something to do with allowing us to salute one flag. It is not about a little speech I give out on the sidewalk thanking them for help. They want to see it in writing. They want to make sure we have their back.

This is a leadership call, you have to make a decision. And the bottom line is we have been elected and federalized by our constituents to make decisions. And I can guarantee you, Mr. MURPHY, there is not a Republican voter or a Democratic voter or any Independent voter who has a problem with accountability, and that is what this bill does.

Now, someone may have a problem with the fact that they didn't do what they needed to do when they were in the majority to do it. And now we have provided an opportunity, and I have pointed out all of the votes here earlier, and then some, of the opportunities that we have allowed Republicans to have a bill that they wanted to vote for all along to the floor, and they voted in the affirmative, even though their leadership voted the other way. Now, that is for their leadership to say that they are accountable to their constituents because they decided to vote against something good.

But when you look at this emergency supplemental, this emergency supplemental is the first time since this war has started, Mr. MURPHY, Members, Mr. Speaker, the first time that the President actually would have a document in writing that passed in the affirmative on this floor to say that the Iraqi Government will meet these benchmarks, or redeployment will stop; to say we will make sure that we invest in veterans health care and giving Homeland Security what they need to be able to carry out the duty and protection of the homeland.

It also says, Department of Defense, pulling a page out of your own regulations, and we are going to put it in the bill to make sure that you actually do it, not just some bureaucrat sitting over there at the Pentagon saying we have to find three more brigades from somewhere, if they are ready or not, we have to make sure that we have the numbers in Iraq. If that soldier has only been home for 120 days, and we call for 200-plus days of downtime with their families to be able to regroup from being in a battle zone, those are rights that our men and women have. So we are no longer leaving that decision up to some bureaucrat in the Pentagon to make on behalf of an American who goes off to fight on our behalf.

Now, is there language in there in case of emergencies; you know, if the

President, within the national interest that we have to redeploy, we have to send these troops back into the theater? Of course there is.

□ 2015

Are we hindering the President from him being Commander in Chief? No, we are not. But what we are saying is that there are rules, and you have to live by those rules. And it is going to be a majority vote here in this House, and the question, Mr. Speaker, how many Members are going to be with us when we make that majority vote here in the House to set forth the parameters of success on behalf of not only the men and women in uniform, but those that have worn the uniform and those that have been injured and cannot return back to battle, and even for those that are going to battle, that they have exactly what they need.

We know that we have the number one best military, most able military on the face of the Earth. But at the same time, we have to have respect for that military and making sure that the men and women have what they need and their families.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, this is about government. I mean, you talk about leadership, it takes leadership to govern.

You are right. I am as close as anybody to what is happening and what people are feeling out there because I spent the last 2 years spending every day and every night visiting the pasta suppers and the pancake breakfasts really, I think, being as in touch as anybody in this Chamber is with where the American people were. And, yes, they have specific irreconcilable grievances with this President about the war, about his approach to energy policy, about his lack of any understanding of health care dilemmas facing the American people.

But I think they also just have this sense that this place is broken down, that Congress couldn't govern any longer, that they couldn't maintain their relationship as a coequal branch of government with the President, that they couldn't even get anything done on meaningful issues like health care reform or immigration or oversight of this war.

So is this bill perfect? Absolutely not. Are there things that you would change in it, things that I would change? Would I move a date around here, some money around there? Absolutely. But you know what? This isn't a place where you just come and vote your preferences. I mean, we are not voting for the American Idol here. We are governing. We are putting votes together to make progress for the American people. And so there are going to be a lot of folks who are going to cast green votes for this, who are going to have problems with certain parts of it. But in order to live up to what the American people want us to do here, which is to set a new direction, we

have all got to come together and find a way to govern. It is something that wasn't happening here for a very long time.

And so I am going to be proud to go back, once we get through this process, once we are able to put something through the House, through the Senate, we hope get the President's signature, I am going to be proud to go back and talk about it, talk about how we have fulfilled that commitment to redeploy our troops, to start spending our money in different places.

But I am going to be just as proud to tell them that Congress is working again; that there is leadership here that is willing to take some tough stands, that is willing to ask some people to cast some votes that might not be perfect for them; that we haven't allowed the perfect to be the enemy of the good, as a lot of people are talking about these days. I am going to be just as proud to talk about how this place is working again, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I can tell you, Mr. MURPHY, it has definitely been a pleasure and a joy to be here on the floor with you tonight. And I know that I have some information that you want to share with the Members that may want to get in contact with us.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. MEEK, the Speaker's 30-something Working Group, and I have been blessed for the last 2 months to be able to join you here on the floor and to have Speaker PELOSI allow us the time. Anything that you want to talk to us about, you can e-mail at [30somethingdems@mail.house.gov](mailto:30somethingdems@mail.house.gov), a lot of the information that we talk about here, as well as information about the 30-something Working Group, at [www.speaker.gov/30something](http://www.speaker.gov/30something).

Mr. MEEK, we hope the people will get in touch with us there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I know the good people of Connecticut have been well served. And we also want to thank, Mr. Speaker, Mr. RYAN for coming down at the top of the hour to spend about 20 minutes with us. That is pretty good for an appropriator.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. They were quality 20 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It was a good quality 20 minutes, I must add. And, Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor and a pleasure to address the House, and I mean the full House. I think it is important that we continue this discussion. As you know, we are going to be dealing with the emergency supplemental on Thursday, and next week we are going to get into the budget. These are real issues.

Timelines will be met. All the appropriations bills are moving through the process. They will be passed on time. We will no longer be in the business of continuing resolutions.

This is so, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say, I used to say in the 109th Congress, I mean, it is kind of rough when you go in front of your hometown and

you say, well, I am a Member of the 109th Congress. It is almost like kind of saying like you are a bad guy. But in the 110th Congress, I must say, and every Member of Congress, I am not talking about just some Members, I am talking about every Member because there were so many issues that were going on here in Washington, D.C.

But now we have the opportunity to work on behalf of the American people. We have the opportunity to do good things for veterans. We have the opportunity to do great things for children that are on military bases. We have an opportunity to make sure that our troops have what they need when they go into harm's way. And that is something we should all feel good about, on both sides of the aisle.

And I think that, come Thursday, Members will have a work product that they will be able to vote for and not think about. I mean, I feel sorry for the Members who have to walk around and say, goodness, I have to vote not to fund operations of troops that are in harm's way. They shouldn't walk around with that burden. They should be able to say that we cannot, I voted for the supplemental. I voted for it twice. They didn't have the parameters and the benchmarks that I wanted in it. But for the greater good, to make sure that our men and women have what they need, Mr. MURPHY, if they are in there doing what they were told to do, that they must have what they need.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that we will continue this debate, and we will also continue to do the good work up here in Washington, D.C.

#### THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker so much for the opportunity to come and address the House once again.

Once again I want to thank the Republican leadership for the opportunity to bring another edition of the Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad is a group of folks on the Republican side who got together and were interested in trying to bring about some correction to the disinformation and the misinformation that so often happens here in Washington.

Listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle for the past couple of minutes, I feel like I am in Alice in Wonderland. They have gone through the looking glass and it is difficult to tell what is real and what is not.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe we have entered a new phase of democracy in our Nation. And I call it Orwellian democracy. What it means is that the majority party, whatever the majority party says is accomplished,

regardless of the actions that they take. And it is so true when you think about the issues that have been brought to the floor this evening. And I want to touch on a few of those before I talk about this incredibly important issue that we have as has been brought to the floor earlier in terms of discussion with the supplemental Iraq resolution to fund and make certain that our troops, our men and women who are defending our liberty, have the appropriate resources that they need.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle talked about the wonderful issues that they have brought and passed on this floor of the House so far this year. They didn't mention that virtually none of them have gotten through the Senate, which is another issue all together.

But they talk about these grand issues, and the statement was made that we "gave Republicans the vote they wanted all along," which is just terribly amusing, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, because what has come to the floor to be voted on in this House of Representatives this session so far have been bills that have had very little input, by and large, from the minority party, very little input, frankly, from the vast majority of the Members of the House.

And so the Official Truth Squad, the role of the Official Truth Squad is to bring light and truth to the issues that we are working with here in the United States Congress. And we have a number of quotes that we enjoy citing. One of my favorite comes from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who was a United States Senator from the State of New York, and a very brilliant man. And he had a saying that he would use from time to time, and it was that everyone is entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts. And I should say, Mr. Speaker, that that quote, the truthfulness of that quote was never more true than right here in the United States Congress because certainly everybody has their own opinion. But if they would look at the facts, if they would look at the facts on behalf of the American people, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we all would be a whole lot better off.

I want to highlight a couple of bills that my friends brought and mentioned as being the wonderful panacea of this new majority, which is taking us in a new direction. That was their slogan over the past campaign. And, Mr. Speaker, they are absolutely right. They are taking us in a new direction. The problem is the direction is backwards.

And a couple of the issues that they cite, the 9/11 Commission, they talk about bringing all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to the floor. In fact, that is not what they did. In fact, they didn't bring the ones that were most important to truly gain control from Congress's standpoint, from an accountability standpoint, over the ability for us to protect our Nation.

They left those out. Now, they don't want to talk about those, but they left those out. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact, not an opinion. That is a fact.

They talk about the fixing of student loans that they did. And certainly student loans are important, and I have all sorts of young people in my district who are desirous of making certain that they can have the opportunity to gain student loans and have the opportunity to further their education. Extremely important issue.

And what the majority party did, at least they would have you believe, is to fix the challenge of providing student loans at a reasonable interest rate. In fact, what they did was bait and switch, for they decrease interest rates for a 6-month period of time, and then it shoots right back up to where it has been. So that is the truth. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. That is not opinion. That is a fact. All you have got to do is read the bill.

And then my favorite bait and switch, my favorite Orwellian phrase, or example of Orwellian democracy that they have is the whole issue of prescription drugs for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, in my previous life, before I came to Congress, I was a physician. I was an orthopedic surgeon, took care of patients for over 20 years. And I knew in my heart of hearts, as my patients knew, that when the Federal Government got involved in the delivery and the minutiae of medicine of taking care of people, it rarely, if ever worked.

And so my good friends on the other side of the aisle say that they have solved the problem of the Medicare part D. Well, the problem that they didn't see is that Medicare part D, which has offered our seniors much greater choice and covered the vast majority of seniors with an opportunity to receive the medications that they desire, the problem that they didn't see is that, or that they won't acknowledge is no problem at all, and that is that the program is working. Eighty to 90 percent of seniors in this Nation are pleased with the options and the choices that they have. But, no, that didn't fit their talking points. And so as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what they did was pass a bill that would go a long way toward limiting the choices of American seniors to have medications that they so desperately need and deserve. And if you didn't believe me, if you didn't believe those were the facts from my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, all you have got to do is turn on your television, because now we have a number of groups who are advocacy groups and groups who look out for seniors who are now advertising to try to get the message to the majority party that, hey, don't do that. That program is working. Leave that program alone. Don't upset my prescription medication. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is on the television. They are advertising that right now because they understand and appreciate

that when government inserts itself into the practice of medicine that the people that lose are the patients.

And so I am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to come down here tonight and to work on setting the record straight, providing some facts.

I do want to utilize a couple of the quotes that my good friend said a little bit earlier, my good friend from Florida said, this is a "better emergency supplemental that is coming to the floor."

What is coming to the floor is a, I hope it is coming to the floor, is a bill that will hopefully provide for the appropriate resources, appropriate monies for our troops to defend our Nation and to continue the incredibly valiant work that they are doing in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 2030

Now, the problem that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have is that they are trying desperately, as valiantly as they can, to make their program make sense. And why, Mr. Speaker, you would ask, are they having trouble having it make sense? Well, the problem that they have is that they really don't believe that the troops and the mission of liberty ought to be supported to the degree that we believe it ought and that it must be in order to maintain our freedom. So they are left with a Nation that desires to support the men and women who are diligently and valiantly defending freedom around the world, left with a Nation that wants to support those individuals, and we are left with a majority party, many of whose Members, including many in the leadership, don't want to do so.

And I don't say that lightly, Mr. Speaker. I say that in all seriousness, and I say that because I know, and you know, that the policy that has been proposed by this majority party now as it relates to the incredibly difficult and brave work that is being done in the Middle East on behalf of all Americans by our troops, the program that the majority party is proposing is a program called "slow bleed." Slow bleed. It kind of gives you chills when you think about it, Mr. Speaker, when it is being used in reference to our Nation and our troops. Slow bleed.

What does it mean? Well, Mr. Speaker, it means that high-ranking members of the majority party, the Democrat Party, have decided that they are not interested in funding the troops. They are not interested in the mission of victory, of liberty over tyranny. They are not interested in that. What they are interested in is removing the funding.

So I quote, Mr. Speaker, a fact. I quote Representative JOHN MURTHA in an interview that he gave just 1 month ago when asked about this slow bleed program that they are trying to put in place. He said, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Mr. Speaker, that is a little concerning. We have men and women who are putting their lives on the line, who are standing in front of enemies the likes of which we have never seen. And here in the United States House of Representatives, this majority party has a Member who is determining funding for the troops who says, "They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, what equipment is he referring to? Well, he is referring to protective armor. He is referring to vehicles that have the appropriate protection from IEDs. He is referring to the kind of air superiority, the air power, that is necessary to protect our troops on the ground. As far as I can tell, he is referring to everything that would be used in the normal course and operation of a military activity.

And why do I say that? I say that because what they are trying to do, what they are attempting to do, is to truly remove from generals on the ground the ability to defend not only their troops, but to defend liberty and defend freedom.

It is a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker. We are at an incredible crossroads in our country's history, and we have a leadership in place that has a difficult time matching their message with their action, because what they want to do doesn't match what the American people want done, and it is extremely difficult for them.

I quote again, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. MURTHA when asked, but why don't you just cut off the funding for the war? This was back on March 4. He was asked on a news program, why don't you just cut off funding for the war? That is the honest thing to do, Mr. Speaker. If they want to have the vote about whether or not we ought to continue our involvement, our protection of liberty, and our engagement in this war on terror, you ought to have that vote. Let us have that vote. Let us have that debate. But, Mr. Speaker, they won't do that. They won't do that.

Why won't they do that? That is what Mr. Russert asked on NBC's Meet the Press on March 4, 2007. He asked Mr. MURTHA, "But why not cut off funding for the war?"

And what did Mr. MURTHA say? "Well, you don't have the votes to do that. We don't have the votes to do that. You just can't go forth, and the public doesn't want—they don't want that to happen."

So, Mr. Speaker, the contortions that you see on behalf of the majority party on this issue are because their desire, their zeal to end support for our men and women who are defending liberty and fighting tyranny and fighting terror around the world don't mesh. They don't mesh.

There are some who get it right, though, throughout Congress, some members of the majority party who understand and appreciate what their leadership is trying to do. One of those is Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN from

Connecticut. Speaker PELOSI was quoted as saying, "Democrats have proposed a different course of action. Over and over again we have suggested a different plan." And Senator LIEBERMAN was very sage when he said, "Any alternatives that I have heard ultimately don't work. They are all about failing. They are all about withdrawing, and I think allowing Iraq to collapse would be a disaster for the Iraqis, for the Middle East, and for us."

Slow bleed, Mr. Speaker. Slow bleed. That is a sad and dangerous time when we find our majority party here in the United States House of Representatives supporting a policy that would remove the ability for our troops to do what they must do to defend our liberty.

What is our principle on our side of the aisle? What is the Republican principle? Well, the principle is that our troops in combat deserve to be sent the resources and the reinforcements that they need to succeed in their mission in Iraq without strings and without delay. Without strings and without delay.

We have, as a matter of fact, a piece of legislation that would do just that. Representative SAM JOHNSON from Texas, a war hero, truly a war hero, an individual who spent years in a prisoner of war camp in Vietnam, an individual who knows of the challenges that troops face when involved with an enemy that is ferocious, but an individual who understands and appreciates that from this Chamber, from that Congress, you cannot micro-manage a war. And when you attempt to do that as a Congress, when you attempt to have 435 Members of Congress who want to all be generals or 100 Members of the United States Senate who want to all be generals or Commanders in Chief, when you have that, it doesn't work. It can't work. It is impossible.

So if you want to have the vote, I tell my friends, I ask my friends, I challenge my friends in the majority party, if you want to have the vote on whether or not we ought to simply cut off the funding to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, let us have that vote. Let us have that vote. I would be interested in the outcome of that. I doubt we would get 100 votes in support of that. And it wouldn't, because that is not what the American people want. The American people don't want failure, and that is the prescription that the Democrats, the majority party, are giving us.

We have a bill, House Resolution 511, introduced by Representative SAM JOHNSON, as I mentioned, and it is very simple. It states what the principle ought to be when American military forces are in harm's way. And that principle says, as this resolution says, "Congress will not cut off or restrict funding for units and members of the Armed Forces that the Commander in Chief has deployed in harm's way in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom." That is it. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with that is that that doesn't fit the bumper-sticker politics of the majority party. That doesn't fit the Orwellian democracy of the majority party. That doesn't fit the hypocritical actions that are being taken by the majority party. And consequently this bill is languishing in committee.

There is a discharge petition, which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is a petition that Members of the House of Representatives can sign to be able to bring legislation out of the committee when it is against the will of the leadership. That discharge petition was begun today. What it allows is Members of the House of Representatives, when there are a majority of them, and that takes 218 Members, when there is a majority of them who sign that, then that bill then comes to the floor of the House for a vote.

So I challenge my friends on both sides of the aisle, House Resolution 511, sign the discharge petition. This is principle. This is principle. This is truth. This is the kind of support that our men and women deserve. It is not feigned support. It is not Orwellian support. It doesn't say, yes, I support you, and then pull the rug out from under you. It is not hypocritical support. It doesn't say we want to support you so very, very much, but we are not going to do what it takes. This says it all. It says that we will not cut off or restrict funding for units or members that are deployed in harm's way. Why can't we have a vote on that, Mr. Speaker? What are they afraid of, Mr. Speaker? What are they afraid of?

I would suggest they are afraid of the fact that this would pass on the floor of the House of Representatives. This bill would pass. And because it doesn't fit their political agenda, their political agenda, then I doubt that we will see it unless we can get 218 Members of the House of Representatives to sign the discharge petition.

So what about this bill that they are going to bring to the floor? What about this supplemental bill that the majority party is planning to bring to the floor this week? Of course, we have been told it would be earlier than this; so they seem to be having some difficulty within their own ranks in garnering support. But what the bill does, as we understand it, is to put in place an inflexible timeline, an inflexible timeline that says that the troops must come home regardless of what is happening on the ground unless the mission is completely accomplished, in essence. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, in battle and in war, it is just not possible to have 535 Commanders in Chief. That is not the way our system works, not the way it ought to work, not the way our Founders envisioned it.

In fact, it is curious, Mr. Speaker, when the Articles of Confederation were written and our Nation was formed, some of the aspects of those articles didn't work very well; so the



Founders of our great Nation got together in a Constitutional Convention, and they worked on issues to try to make certain that this Federalist system, this United States, could come together and work together. And one of the first things that they did was recognize that in the Articles of Confederation there were no provisions for a Commander in Chief. So one of the easiest things that they were able to do was to get consensus on the fact that the Commander in Chief ought to be one individual, and that that individual ought to be the President of the United States and the executive branch, and that that was the only way to work it because obviously you couldn't have countless Members of the House of Representatives or countless Members of the United States Senate who were functioning as Commanders in Chief. It doesn't work, and they recognized that.

So putting in place an inflexible timeline that culminates with a date certain for the withdrawal micromanages our commanders in the field, and it undermines the efforts of our troops on the ground. I believe that. I believe that putting in place the kind of artificial timelines and artificial constraints on our commanders, on our generals, on our troops would be a disaster. It doesn't make any sense. All it does is make political points. And that, Mr. Speaker, isn't fact. Isn't fact. It is just not Republicans who believe that that would be the wrong course. There is a remarkable orchestra of individuals and groups all around the Nation that are standing up now and speaking out against the foolishness of that kind of proposal.

□ 2045

I cite for you, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post. Now, the Washington Post is a wonderful newspaper. It has been around for a long time. But nobody would contend that the Washington Post was a very conservative newspaper or a great friend of conservative thought. Nobody would contend that.

But what does the Washington Post say about this plan of the majority, about the Democrat plan? They say, "It is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself." That, Mr. Speaker, was written on March 13, just 1 week ago. "An attempt to impose detailed management on the war without regard for the war itself."

What volumes that speaks, when you think about where it is coming from. It is not coming from individuals who would have any political chip, no political reason to embarrass the majority party or to call them out on a policy that may not necessarily be very sound. What that does is demonstrate that they understand and appreciate the consequence of adopting what is supposed to come to this floor this week as the Iraq war supplemental would be devastating for the nation of Iraq, for the Middle East, for the United States, and, yes, for the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the Iraq Study Group. The Iraq Study Group was the bipartisan group that got together, actually a group that began because Representative FRANK WOLF, a Republican in this House, added it to a piece of legislation that was passed almost a year ago. What it said is that we ought to have a bipartisan group get together and work in a non political way to make recommendations to the executive branch and to Congress about how to move forward in Iraq.

They came up with a number of recommendations. We hear it all the time from the other side that the Iraq Study Group didn't endorse this or didn't propose this or didn't support that; that they supported a withdrawal of the troops from Iraq; that they didn't support any escalation in the number.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look on page 73 of the Iraq Study Group, Mr. Speaker, that is another fact, if you look on page 73 of the Iraq Study Group report, it, in fact, supports an escalation, a small escalation, of the number of troops in Iraq. What they also did was oppose a date certain for withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, again a fact. I quote from one of the cochairman, former Secretary of State James Baker, who said in testifying before the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "The Study Group set no timetables and we set no deadlines. We believe that military commanders must have the flexibility to respond to events on the ground."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues here in the House heard that. I hope that they are listening, because what they are saying, what the Iraq Study Group said is exactly what we are saying now, and that is that this supplemental bill that has artificial timetables and artificial deadlines that are capricious and politically motivated, clearly that that kind of action is not appropriate, it wasn't called for by the Iraq Study Group, and would not allow the military commanders to have the flexibility that they need to succeed.

How about the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Speaker, again, not a paper in our Nation that has tended to be terribly friendly to conservatives or Republicans. The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial on March 12, when it had reviewed what the majority party was proposing in this supplemental Iraq war resolution to fund the hard, incredibly diligently working men and women who are defending liberty, what did the Los Angeles Times say? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. Vetoed, Mr. Speaker. Why would they do that?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our receiving a message from the Senate. The message from the Senate is that a Senate bill was passed, and we are pleased to see that. We look forward to the time when the Senate will take up some of the legislation that the House

majority has passed, that they have been so terribly proud of, and look forward to working in concert on that legislation.

But I was talking, Mr. Speaker, about the supplemental war resolution that will come forward, the bill that will provide for appropriate funding of our troops in harm's way, defending liberty and defending us, and the proposal that is coming from the majority party is a proposal that would micromanage the operations of our troops. It is a proposal that has been described as "slow bleed," which is a proposal that means that you will defund, you will remove the funding from the men and women who are working so valiantly to defend us.

That is not just an opinion from our side of the aisle. That is an opinion from all over. Many people are recognizing that. The Washington Post, as I mentioned, had an editorial that criticized the majority party for coming forward with it. The Iraq Study Group supports, in fact, a minor, small escalation in the number of troops, and never said, Mr. Speaker, never said that they agreed with artificial timelines. The Los Angeles Times, again, Mr. Speaker, a paper that has not been noted for its friendliness to our side of the aisle, called for the bill to be vetoed. They called for the bill to be vetoed. Why did they do so? They said, "It is absurd for House Speaker NANCY PELOSI to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks."

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. March 12 of this year, the Los Angeles Times calls the war supplemental "absurd."

And what about the National Intelligence Estimate? The National Intelligence Estimate, which was released in January, warned of the dangers of early troop withdrawal. They said that if coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to give credibility to the National Intelligence Estimate. Those are the folks that determine in an objective way, in a non political way, what are the consequences or prospective consequences of actions that this Nation takes.

This poster here talks about the consequences of failure. It is important that we talk about the consequences of failure, because many people, not just on our side of the aisle, but many people around this Nation, including the Washington Post, including the Los Angeles Times, have concluded for themselves that the proposal that the majority party has put forward is a bill that will result in defeat or failure in Iraq. So it is important that we look, Mr. Speaker, at the consequences of failure for our Nation. What are the consequences of failure?

This is from the National Intelligence Estimate. What they say is that Iraqi security forces would be subject to sectarian control; that interference by neighboring countries would occur in an open conflict, that means Iran, Syria, other neighboring countries; that massive civilian casualties and population displacement would occur. Massive civilian casualties.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the majority party, the leadership in the majority party, has considered the consequences of that? What would happen? Al Qaeda in Iraq would plan increased attacks inside and outside of Iraq, and spiraling violence and political disarray, including Kurdish attempts at autonomy in Kirkuk.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, clearly, failure, failure will result in a much worse situation for the people in Iraq, the people in the Middle East; I would suggest much more danger in the Middle East and for our friends in Israel; and, Mr. Speaker, it would result in a much more dangerous situation, I believe, for the United States of America.

So, what are they doing? What is the other side doing to try to pass this piece of legislation, this hypocritical piece of legislation, this piece of legislation that they are having such difficulty doing, because, again, what the American people want and what they in their rhetoric, what the majority party in their rhetoric, say are two completely different things. So what are they having to do?

Well, they are having to use a lot of what has come to be known in this town, Mr. Speaker, as pork. The original estimate for the bill was about \$100 billion. About \$100 billion, Mr. Speaker. The other side has now added over \$20 billion to the bill. And what are they doing, Mr. Speaker? They are buying votes. They are buying votes.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an emergency bill, this is an emergency bill to fund our troops, is not the appropriate vehicle for unrelated spending, either foreign or domestic. Our troops ought not be bargaining chips. Our troops ought not be bargaining chips. That is what the majority party is doing.

Quoted here in a publication here in Washington earlier this month, it says, "Democratic leaders see this emerging strategy as a way to encourage their liberal members to vote for the supplemental budget bill." This emerging strategy is buying votes, adding all sorts of items to the bill.

Curiously, this party, the majority party, ran in their campaign on this wonderful issue of fiscal responsibility, financial responsibility, making certain that everything that came through Congress was paid for. They call it PAYGO, pay-as-you-go; make certain that you have got the resources in place in order to pay for whatever proposal you are moving forward.

Well, they have virtually thrown that out the window. We have had a number of amendments on bills that

would hold their feet to the fire and make certain that they were accountable on this PAYGO issue, and they have defeated everything that would make them accountable.

They are doing the same thing here. They willfully abandoned their pledge of fiscal responsibility. Not long ago they pledged to follow pay-as-you-go budget rules and spending restraints to curb the deficit, and this bill would not be subject to PAYGO.

Last year, it is important to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that House Republicans rejected a \$14 billion increase in nonemergency spending that the Senate tried to attach to an emergency troop funding bill; \$14 billion was saved for the American taxpayer in a bill that came to the floor of the House from the Senate just last year. Under a different majority we saved \$14 billion. The majority party now is going to spend, if they have their way with this bill, at least \$21 billion more than has been requested.

That is important, Mr. Speaker, because this is an emergency bill, and as such it doesn't come under the normal budgetary rules. So if they are able to spend \$21 billion in this piece of legislation, then what happens is that they don't need to spend that \$21 billion in the normal course of activity, in the normal budgetary process, so it frees up another \$21 billion, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, what you get is \$42 billion of more spending, extra spending.

But, Mr. Speaker, our troops deserve the resources that should be in this bill, the finite resources, the resources that the President and the generals and the commanders in the field have requested. They should be able to receive those resources now, not after, not after our friends on the other side of the aisle in the majority party carry out this incredible political charade of voting on a bill that will never become law in its current form because the Senate, the Senate, won't go along. They have, in essence, said so.

Mr. Speaker, there are some incredible quotes that I have regarding this issue of micromanaging the war and this issue of loading the bill up with pork. There is a Democratic claim earlier this year, just last week, as a matter of fact, from Majority Leader STENY HOYER, who said, "There is no micromanaging of the war, period."

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I already have outlined that individuals outside of the Republican Party and the Republican cause have reached the conclusion that, yes, in fact this is micromanagement: Again, the Los Angeles Times editorial where they said it is "absurd" that they try to micromanage the war. The Washington Post editorial said, in short, the Democratic proposal to be taken up this week is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself. Aggressive oversight is quite different from mandating military steps according to an inflexible timetable.

Even some of their own Members have reached the conclusion that this, indeed, is micromanaging the war. Representative DAN BOREN of Oklahoma said just 2 weeks ago, "It is still micromanaging of the war."

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, this plan that our friends on the other side of the aisle have truly does a disservice to the discussion, does a disservice to the debate, makes it seem that all votes are for sale here in Washington to Members of the House. Really, it is a cynical ploy. Spending the kind of money they are proposing to spend is not helpful at all.

Where are they planning to put some of that money? It is important to look at that. We talk about the Iraq emergency war supplemental, an extra \$21 billion. Where would some of that money go? Well, \$1.8 billion in crop disaster assistance. It may be appropriate money to be spent, Mr. Speaker, but in an emergency war supplemental, it is absolutely the wrong place. If you will recall, if this House, if this majority party has its way and puts that money there, what it will allow them to do is increase somewhere else spending by \$1.8 billion and follow their shadow PAYGO rules.

\$60 million for salmon fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, it truly is a cynical ploy on the part of this majority party if they continue to march down this road of packing this legislation with all sorts of extraneous spending that nobody in their logical, correct, factual, truthful mind could conclude was related to the emergency war supplemental. \$60 million for salmon fisheries; \$25 million for spinach growers. Spinach growers may indeed need some emergency assistance, but in an emergency war supplemental? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, \$50 million for asbestos abatement in the Capitol, and it goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, there are very specific guidelines in this bill for our troops, very specific dates about when they must be at a certain place in the accomplishment, in the engagement, in the execution of the challenges that they have before them, very specific. In this bill there is very specific language about the amount of money that is available for the troops and when it would be cut off if in fact those arbitrary timelines and benchmarks were not met.

But, Mr. Speaker, I learned this afternoon something very, very interesting, and that is there is a significant amount of money for livestock, American livestock, in this bill. That is real pork, if you will. It may be upwards of billions of dollars, but I can't tell you exactly what it is because in the language of the bill it says that the amount of money that will be available for this livestock provision will be "such sums as may be necessary." Mr. Speaker, that is unlimited. And it struck me as truly ironic and sad that this majority party, this Democrat

leadership, believes we ought to have an unlimited amount of funds for livestock in this Nation and a finite and limited amount of money for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, that contrast just speaks volumes. It speaks volumes about the cynicism with which this House is being led, about the hypocrisy by which this bill is being brought to the floor. An unlimited amount of money for livestock in America and finite, limited amounts of money and arbitrary guidelines, arbitrary timelines for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, it saddens me. It saddens me to serve in a body where the majority party has a leadership that is that cynical and brings the debate and the items that we discussed here on the floor of the House to a point that is so very, very trite really. So very, very trite.

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few minutes left, and I wanted to spend a few moments discussing the larger issue, the larger war on terror. I think it is important we do that because when the American people think about the issue in Iraq and whether or not we ought to be there, and the debate can be had about whether or not we ought to be there, and that is an appropriate debate to have. And I wish we could have an honest and open debate and an honest and open vote on whether or not we ought to be there, a single vote on that; but the majority party has seen not to bring that kind of open and honest debate to the floor of the House of Representatives.

But when Americans think about what is going on in the world, they understand and appreciate that however things have been executed or delivered in Iraq, the activity that has gone on on behalf of the American people in Iraq, although they may have problems with that, they understand and appreciate that the bigger picture, the larger war on terror, is a challenge that we must recognize in America and we all must face. It is a challenge and the facing of an enemy the likes of which we have never seen.

You don't have to go far to find examples of that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the best examples I have found are those that come from the self-proclaimed enemies themselves. This is a quote, Mr. Speaker, from Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, an individual with whom we had as far as I know no concerns before he decided that he wanted to become a mortal enemy of the free world. He acted upon that in a way that has been extremely treacherous. He said, "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a little chilling, but it is important that we recognize that is the nature of the enemy in this war on terror. The consequences of not engaging and not being certain that we prevail in this war on terror, the consequences of failure in that activity would deliver a

death knell to our society. The issue is as large as that.

I try to visit schools in my district, the Sixth District of Georgia as often as possible, and I like to talk to young people and get their perspective on their life and what they see in the future. Most of them are very, very hopeful; and I share that hope and optimism for the future of our Nation. But oftentimes when we are talking about government and talking about politics and talking about the issues of the day, I will ask them, especially the middle school students and the high school students, I will ask them: Do you believe the United States will continue to survive forever? And it is an interesting question because it forces one to think, well, what allows us to survive right now? What has been put in place that allows us to survive right now?

Most young people when you ask them that question, they have not really ever thought about that. They have not thought about what has brought about the preservation of our Nation, the longest surviving democracy in the history of the world. It is a remarkable question to ask. Most of them have not ever thought about it; but when they do think about it, they understand the gravity of the question. They understand that there are challenges in this world. They understand there are people like Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi out there who want to see the end of our Nation as we know it. That is not our opinion; that is his stated fact. That is what he has said that he wants to do. So, Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the challenge that we have facing us is real, and the magnitude of it is remarkable. And the ferocity of the enemy is unlike any we have ever faced.

When I get individuals to tell me, well, if you just think about this in the way we fought World War II or previous wars in which we prevailed, then you will appreciate we need to do X, Y and Z. But I would suggest that the enemy that we are up against is not like any enemy we have faced. If you don't believe me, all you have to do is think about the terrorist plot and the attacks that were foiled because of the wonderful intelligence work on the part of Great Britain and the United States and Pakistan last August. And that plot as you will remember was a plot to bring down at least 10 or more civilian airlines carrying enough people who were flying across the Atlantic Ocean to bring them down in a terrorist act so they could kill more people than were killed on 9/11. So they had to have 10 or a dozen planes that they would work in concert to bring down. That plot was foiled. That was a real plot. That was a real plan on the part of our enemy.

And that plan itself is chilling enough, Mr. Speaker; but when you realize and appreciate that two of the individuals who were apprehended and had participated in the planning of that and were intent on carrying out

that act were a married couple, a mom and a dad with an 8-month-old child, and they were going to use that 8-month-old child's baby food in the airplane to be the vessel for carrying the bomb on board. They were going to kill themselves and their 8-month-old child and bring down a plane and kill as many innocent civilians as they could.

Mr. Speaker, that is an enemy whose ferocity we can't even comprehend. That is an enemy who says: We have declared a fierce war on this evil principle of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology. That is an enemy the likes of which we have never seen, and that is an enemy that requires that we in the United States House of Representatives work in concert together, that understand and appreciate the gravity of our time, of this time and make certain that we do all that we can to follow the principles that have allowed us to become the longest-surviving democracy on the face of the Earth.

Part of those principles are embodied in the United States Constitution. Part of that United States Constitution that has allowed us to prevail and to have the greatest amount of success and provide the greatest amount of freedom for the greatest number of people ever in the history of mankind, part of those principles stipulate that there is one Commander in Chief, not 535.

So if the majority party wants to have a vote about whether or not we want to end the funding for the battle that our Commander in Chief believes we must be engaged in in order to make this next step in the larger war on terror, if the majority party wants to have that vote, then let's have that vote. But to do so as they are planning to do this week, in a cynical and hypocritical way, to load up the bill with so much extraneous spending, tens of billions of dollars in order to buy votes to pass this hypocritical and cynical bill that micromanages this incredibly important endeavor that we are engaged in right now is wrong. It does an injustice and a disservice to not just this body but our entire Nation.

I urge my colleagues to encourage leadership on both sides of the aisle to support that open and honest debate. I know on our side we are ready for that debate. We are ready for that debate. I would hope that the Speaker and the Democrat leadership would encourage and support that debate as well.

□ 2115

It is an incredible privilege to come to the floor of the House and share these words, Mr. Speaker. I thank my leadership for that opportunity.

It is very humbling to serve in the United States House of Representatives, a body in which 10,000 or 11,000 or so individuals have served in the history of our Nation. It is a great responsibility in serving in this body, but the primary responsibility is to make certain that we do all that we can to preserve and protect our Constitution and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest humbly that the bill that is being proposed by the majority leadership this week on the supplemental emergency war resolution is not a bill that does a service to our Nation and does credit to the work of this House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to bring forth the bill that will show that, in fact, we do indeed support the troops in harm's way.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a-1928d, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the spring session, to be held in Madeira, Portugal, May 2007:

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, in accordance with the qualifications specified under section 1238(b)(3)(E) of Public Law 106-398, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individual to the United States-China Economic Security Review commission:

Mr. Mark Esper of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2008.

#### HUMAN PAPILLOMA VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, this looks like Georgia night in the great Chamber of the House of Representatives. My colleague, Representative PRICE, just talked about one of the most important debates that we have had in this body in a long time and will have in regard to the situation in Iraq and the Commander in Chief and the constitutional right for the Commander in Chief to make the decisions along with the combatant commanders.

These issues are hugely important. Things like the energy crisis that we

faced 25 years ago, and we are facing again today, are hugely important issues. In fact, former Vice President Gore will be before the Science and Energy and Commerce Committees on Thursday talking about global warming and what we think we ought to do in regard to not only solving the energy crisis, but to keep from polluting the atmosphere. Hugely important issue.

Trying to solve the crisis that is looming in regard to the entitlement spending which is, that along with the interest on the debt, is probably approaching 65 percent of what we spend each year in a \$2.7 trillion budget, hugely important issue.

Then, Mr. Speaker, every now and then along comes something that maybe does not get at first notice very much. There is not a lot of press. It is not one of the marquee issues of the day, but what I am speaking to my colleagues about tonight is also hugely important, and it, thank goodness, is beginning to get the attention that it deserves.

That is an issue that I, as a physician and OB/GYN specialist in particular, physician Member of this body, feel very, very strongly about. What I am referring to is the recent decision by one of the Governors of our 50 States to mandate that young girls in the public school system of that particular State would be required to receive a new vaccine, which I will describe in detail in just a minute.

They would be required before they could enter the sixth grade, the sixth grade, we all know sixth, seventh and eighth, and in some cases, considered the middle school years. So coming out of elementary or what I used to call grammar school, where there are many of these young girls, including my precious granddaughters, are still thinking about watching Little House on the Prairie as an example or playing with their dolls, would be required, just like they would be required to have their shots up to date in regard to measles and mumps and rubella and chickenpox, these highly contagious, infectious diseases that can be acquired just on casual contact; if you sneeze in the vicinity of a classmate, the disease is spread. This new vaccine, though, is not against one of these highly contagious communicable diseases, no, Mr. Speaker.

This vaccine, called Gardasil, is a vaccine against cervical cancer-causing viruses, referred to as human papilloma virus, or HPV. There are probably 100 strains of that virus in existence that have been identified, but four of them, virus number 6, number 11 and particularly number 16 and number 18, have been associated with the dreaded disease of cervical cancer about 70 percent of the time. About 70 percent of the cases that occur, the 9,000 new cases that occur in this country every year, are associated with that HPV virus. So there is certainly a suggestion, a strong suggestion, of cause and effect.

One of our great pharmaceutical companies in this country developed a vaccine that was approved a year ago, June of 2006, to prevent the contraction of this HPV virus, and it is a great vaccine. The studies, the phase III trials, while there, Mr. Speaker, may be some minor side effects, the safety seems to be there. The recommendation, of course, is that sexually active young women between the ages of, well, actually 9 and 16, I would hasten to add that there are not too many 9-year-olds that are sexually active, but the vaccine is approved for those in that age group.

It is thought that a series of three vaccines, given a month or two apart, at the cost of \$360 just for the vaccine, probably up to \$500 once you add the cost of going to a physician, going to a gynecologist and having these vaccines administered, the cost of an office visit, the administration of the vaccine, probably a \$500 charge, but a good investment in this humble Member, physician Member, former gynecologist, in his opinion, probably a good choice for a young woman even at the age of 14 or 15, if she is sexually active or going to be sexually active, or maybe even a little bit younger if her parents are concerned about that possibility.

Then I think the vaccination that has been developed by this pharmaceutical company and the vaccine referred to earlier, Gardasil, I would highly recommend, and if I was still practicing medicine, Mr. Speaker, and a mom brought her daughter in and asked me about that and said that she heard about it and wondered if I would recommend it, I would absolutely recommend it.

But what was done in the last month or so, and this Member just happened to notice, and that is why I say this maybe seems like a small thing, but what it does is the mandate was issued that every single girl in that State at age 11, before going from elementary school, grammar school, to middle school, would have to have that vaccine, or she would not be able to continue in that public school system.

Mr. Speaker, that is just flat wrong, and my bill that I introduced the very next day in this body, H.R. 1153, the title of that bill is the Parental Right to Decide Protection Act, because this is all about the rights of a parent to decide what is best for their child. There is no State interest in this because, as I point out, you do not contract human papilloma virus by casual contact. No, it is by sexual activity, and to force every single 11-year-old child in this country to get that vaccination or they cannot go to the public school system, even though they have paid their property taxes, they live in that school district, they have been in that school district, they have supported that school district, and their parents teach their children, maybe they believe firmly in abstinence-based sexual education, but they have that right to decide. The State does not have that right.

That is why I say to my colleagues tonight that this is a hugely important issue. Cancer is a dreaded disease. We all probably would choose any other way to die than from a long, protracted case of any kind of cancer. Cervical cancer worldwide is probably the second leading cause of cancer death in women. That is not true in the United States. It may be the ninth or tenth or eleventh but it is too many. There are probably 9,700 new cases of cervical cancer in this country every year, and of those, approximately 3,700 die, and that is too many. We need to do everything that we can to prevent cervical cancer, and that is why I say the vaccine is a good thing.

That is why I say that I, as a compassionate physician Member of this body, would recommend that vaccine to someone who has either told their parents that their daughter and her boyfriend are sexually active or they plan to be sexually active, and that could be 14 years of age. I know we all would hope that it would not be, but our daughter or granddaughter, but it could, and in those cases the recommendation to voluntarily take this opportunity to get that immunization on board really before they become sexually active, certainly before they become sexually active with multiple partners, is a good thing, but it is not a good thing to mandate it and to require it.

We will talk about this throughout the hour, and I am very, very pleased to welcome one of my colleagues, a new Member, a very bright Member. He does not seem like a new Member because he is doing such a great job in these first 3 months of the 110th Congress. At this point I would like to yield to my good friend Mr. JORDAN for his comments.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate Dr. GINGREY's work on this legislation and other legislation. I think he is right on target with this Parental Right to Decide Protection Act.

Like the doctor, I, too, understand the importance of vaccines, but I also understand, as the Representative was talking about, the importance of parents having control and the ability to direct their children in the upbringing of their children.

My concern about this, what we are seeing being done in the States around the country is just what Mr. GINGREY talked about, this mandatory approach to this vaccine. In fact, we have legislation that has been introduced in my home State, Ohio, which would, if, in fact, it would pass, would require parents to opt out of the program; not take an affirmative step and opt in, but instead opt out, and instead puts the onus on parents to go in the other direction.

One of the things I believe in so strongly is that we policymakers should make decisions based on what is best for families. We should filter

things through a fundamental question: Does it help families? If the answer to that question is yes, we should be for it.

My concern with what we have been talking about here this evening in this mandatory approach is that it undermines the importance of families, undermines the role that parents have to play in the upbringing of their children.

America is a great country. It is the greatest Nation in history for many reasons: the rights we have; the fact that we have the right to vote; the freedom of speech; the freedom of assembly; the freedom to go after our goals, our dreams; the rule of law; all those wonderful things in the Bill of Rights and our Constitution and our heritage and our history that make America special.

But one thing that makes this country special is this idea that parents are willing to sacrifice and do things so that their children can have life a little better than they did. Those youngsters in turn will do the same thing for their kids. It has been that concept and that approach and that phenomenon that has truly made America prosper and grow over the years.

Again, my concern is that this moves in the opposite direction and begins to undermine that.

□ 2130

You think about all the things that parents are willing to do to help their kids and make decisions in their best interests, and they should have that same prerogative here.

I was reminded of legislation that we dealt with, Doctor, in my time in the Ohio General Assembly. We dealt with a bill that actually required, a good bill, I voted for it, before a minor, and, again, we are talking, as I think you indicated in your opening remarks, we are talking about 6th graders here, young ladies. We dealt with the legislation in my time in the Ohio General Assembly which required parental consent before a minor could get a tattoo or any type of body piercing.

Yet here we have something this important, this serious, and it would require parents opting out, not opting in on the front end. I think it's important to keep those concepts in mind as we move forward.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Ohio, and this point about opt in-opt out, on most of the bills that have been introduced, probably, in maybe 23 or 24 States, not a Governor issued a mandate, but where bills were actually introduced. The opt-out provision actually requires one of two things, either a doctor's excuse or the parent to sign that they want their child to not take the vaccines, but they have to have it notarized.

Just think about the burden that really puts on people to try to find a notary. I mean, it's just not that easy to do, and it's certainly not easy to get a doctor to write an opt-out provision.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's comments there. You know, it's almost as if there is this underlying belief in the way many of these proposals are structured, that the State knows better than mom and dad. We all know that is not the case. Even though some parents sometimes may make poor decisions on behalf of their kids, on behalf of their children, in the vast majority of cases, parents make infinitely better decisions than the State, than the politicians, than the bureaucrats can ever dream of making.

Then this whole approach seems to undermine that concept which has, again, been fundamental, I believe, to the greatness of our country.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for being with me tonight as long as he can stay. I appreciate his input, his comments. He is right on target.

Statistics suggest, and this is actually from the center of the CDC in Atlanta, my home, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that about 6.2 million Americans become infected with HPV each year. Over half, now listen to this, my colleagues, over half of all sexually active men and women become infected at some time in their lives, over half of all sexually active men and women become infected at some time in their lives with the HPV virus.

Now, if you do the math on that, and I think I am correct if my Georgia Tech math serves me well, that means that about 0.2 percent, 0.2, not 2 percent, but 0.2 percent of women who are actually infected with HPV virus, 16 or 18, the virus that this vaccine would prevent, even if they contract the virus, only 0.2 percent.

Well, I said at the outset of the discussion that accounts to, in this country about 9,700 new cases of cervical cancer each year and over 3,000 deaths. Even though it's a small, small number, it has significance, clearly. But you have to ask yourself if that would warrant vaccinating mandatorily every little 11-year-old girl in every public school system in all 50 States of this country.

I don't have the number, how many little girls that would be; but I will tell you one thing, it's far more than this number. Then there are some other things that we can discuss in regard to risk and adverse reactions, even though the FDA, and I don't disagree with the decision, the trials that show this vaccine is safe, but yet it has only been on the market for less than a year. All of a sudden, the big experimental model is going to be my granddaughters and your daughters all across this country. I think that is absolute insanity.

At this time, I want to yield to my good friend from New Jersey, my classmate, Representative SCOTT GARRETT, for his comments.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I just come to the floor tonight to commend

you and to commend the work you have done on this area with your legislation, and also your efforts tonight to try to educate the Members of this House and also the American public as well. A couple of points come to mind, and you have touched on some of them, but they hit home for me, and that is the missed opportunities of resources, is one; the issue of parental rights is another; and the overall issue of the public being mindful of what they need to look out for when it comes to campaigns. I know you touched on each of those briefly.

I had the opportunity to meet today with different groups, as you know we do, all day when we are not on the floor and in committee rooms. The issue of education and the issue of raising our kids came up, and we were talking about other issues other than this one. But the bottom-line issue always came to this, who cares more about your kids than you do? Who cares more about my children than I do?

Other people may, the teachers in the school, the local school boards may care for them, the health officials or the county and the State in Trenton, my capital, may, the bureaucrats down here in Washington or someone else may have some concern, but no one is going to care as much as the parents. We know that loving interest that the parents have in their children is that they are going to be doing right by them. Secondly, the parents are going to know what is the best interest of that child more than anyone else.

Parents are going to know the difference between that child, who, as you described before, may be 11 years old and in many circumstances no way, shape or form is going to be sexually active; and parents know other children, 15, 16 years old have been, are starting to be sexually active, in which case this treatment, the shot or what have you, would be appropriate.

I think it's what the Founding Fathers intended for this country is to have control over our lives, at the local level most possible, and when it comes to children, the most local level is the home setting and the parents.

So the point is that those decisions that are touching the intimate aspect of our lives and our children are best left to the parents themselves and not some bureaucrat outside.

The second issue is resources. You were just touching upon one when I came in. You kindly yielded over to me. The issue is about the cost and how widespread this will be, how many kids, children, this could be used for across the entire country, if what is being done in Texas and elsewhere is going to be spread across the country.

We live, as you know here, with limited resources, certainly limited medical resources. We want to make sure that those limited resources go to the most areas necessary. I always say, in our budget meetings, you can spend a dollar once, but that is it. You can't spend it a second or a third time. Once it's spent, it's spent.

So when it comes to our health care dollars, we have to decide. I rely on health officials or health professionals such as you to help us to make those decisions where those limited dollars should go, and where there is not a need. When you are talking about 8, 9, 10, 11-year-old girls who are not sexually active and most likely will not be sexually active until their maturity, there is no medical necessity for that.

The third point I think is this: I think this whole discussion here should be an eye opener, a light bulb going off, something. As I say, an eye opener for parents and citizens across this country to see how things can move so quickly and touch upon your families without you even knowing about it.

One day you are sitting at home and your wife and kids in the kitchen are just going about your normal routine, getting ready to go off to school, or what have you. The next day, all of a sudden, you are getting an edict from the Governor someplace or some other bureaucrat telling us your child is going to have to be inoculated for an ailment that they are never going to get.

How does that happen? It happens in a way in this case as we saw with an instructive affirmative campaign in various places around this country, saying, you know, a push by certain factors, pushing out, saying this should be done.

Then what happened after that? Well, the media jumps on board, as they often do, and sells us, says this is a great thing, how can you say no to this. All of a sudden it has become politically incorrect for you to stand up and say, wait a minute, I may have a question about this. Wait a minute, these are my little kids you are talking about. Wait a minute, my personal physician or pediatrician says there is no need for this. All of a sudden you are backed into a corner.

This is a case where I think a light bulb should go off for all parents and citizens across the country just to see how quickly these things can come down. That is why I came to the floor tonight just to commend you for throwing the light of day on this very important topic and illuminating it for all of us and for the people watching this evening to realize this is happening now. There may be other things that they need to be paying attention to, again, with regard to the health care of their children.

Mr. GINGREY. I really appreciate my friend from New Jersey. As we all know, every Member in this body knows, he is a strong, strong fiscal conservative. He pointed out the fact that we have very limited dollars. Every day, each one of us, Representative JORDAN, his constituents come up here from Ohio, and Representative GARRETT's constituents from New Jersey, mine from Georgia, and each one of them has a request. Many of them are health-care related.

Today I was visited by a mom who has two autistic children. Maybe my

colleagues had constituents advocating on behalf of more funding for autism, and it goes on and on and on. It is our job, with limited dollars, to try to decide how to apply them for the greater good.

I really appreciate the gentleman's comments in regard to putting the money where it's going to be most effective and not to waste it, not to waste those precious dollars. As he pointed out, you can only spend that dollar once.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I just want to pick up on where Congressman GARRETT had kind of emphasized what he had talked about. It is almost as if some people are saying parents aren't smart enough. Parents are smart enough to figure out where their kids need to go to school. They are smart enough to help and save and invest and help their kids get a college education.

They are smart enough to forgo opportunities for themselves and make sacrifices so their kids can have a little better life than they did and further that American Dream and further the prosperity of this country. Yet somehow they are not smart enough in this area.

I think it is important we never undermine that basic fact that parents know best. We had sent a letter to the Governor of our State. We have had legislation introduced in Ohio. I said in that letter, I said, in addition to this bill, this concept is being introduced in Ohio making inappropriate suppositions about the promiscuity of 6th grade girls. I share the view of many that this will lead to further erosion of the rights of parents to instruct the upbringing of their children.

Again, that is why the sponsor of this bill has so appropriately named it, protecting parental rights. That is so important.

Again, I just wanted to, before I have to leave, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New Jersey for his remarks this evening.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for being with us tonight. I mentioned at the outset about the statistics with regard to cervical cancer worldwide being the second leading cause of cancer death in women, but maybe 9th or 10th in this country, and the difference is attributed to the fact that in this country, since the mid-1940s with the discovery of the pap smear, the value of the pap smear to screen for cervical cancer was discovered. Annual checkups were recommended for sexually active, certainly for sexually active adult women, and, again, that could start at age 14 in many instances. In some instances, it may be when a young girl is going off to college, or maybe on occasion it is not till someone is 22 or 23 years old.

But at that point in her life, the most important way to prevent cervical cancer or to be able to have early detection, when it can be cured, is by having that physical examination done on a timely basis.



□ 2145

For the most part, the recommendation is a yearly exam. And I think most women in this country get that examination on an annual or maybe every 2-year basis if they have gone several years with normal Pap smears. And it is very simple, almost painless, not something that they would rush to have done, but women know the importance of this for their protection.

Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns that unless we do a great job of educating the public in regard to this vaccine, that women might get the idea that, first of all, the vaccine protects them against sexually transmitted diseases. And it does protect them against HPV virus, that virus that causes genital warts in the 0.2 percent of cases that can actually lead to cervical cancer, but it offers no protection against things like herpes and syphilis and HIV/AIDS. And I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to do that and get overly descriptive. But it only protects against that one sexually transmitted disease that is associated with cervical cancer.

I want to give my colleague from New Jersey an opportunity in the time left to weigh in a bit.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

You brought up another fact, which was good, and then you went on to the details of it more. But I think the point you raised was a good one and I would like to elaborate on for 30 seconds, and that is this: That young girls do go in this country to see their doctors, they do go to see their pediatricians. And the concern I had before, that I mentioned just about 5 minutes ago, that this current action is intervening and causing a wedge, is causing a wedge between the parent and the child.

The point that you are alluding to here as well is now we are actually having another wedge. I said before, the closest relation out there should be between the parent and the child, father and mother and the daughter. Maybe the next close relationship is between the doctor, the pediatrician and the child. And that is what we are talking about here when you are talking about a 9-, 10-, or 11-year-old girl is a child. So not only are we driving a wedge between the parent and the child now, the State is now also driving this wedge between the doctor, the pediatrician and the child as well.

The American College of Pediatrics and the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons are opposed in these circumstances to legislation which would require HPV vaccinations for school attendance, because they know that they are already having that correct and proper relationship. They are already seeing that little girl once a year usually for examination. They are making the examination, and I presume that they would be able to make that determination if that child is becoming sexually active and what have

you. And so they would be, just as the parents are, in a better position than a bureaucrat in a State capital someplace or a bureaucrat here in Washington to determine what sort of treatment or what sort of inoculations are needed.

So I just want to draw out that point you raised, that two wedges now of very close familial contact have been created by this new proposal to require this for young children. So I appreciate your bringing that point out.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

As I was pointing out in regard to this annual checkup, it is not just for the Pap smear and for screening for cervical cancer, but also for a complete wellness examination in women to detect very early breast cancer, a small lump that maybe the patient cannot detect or that is not picked up on a mammogram. But the opportunity is so invaluable to screen for not only cervical cancer, but for colon cancer and breast cancer.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important than that periodic checkup for adult women to have every 1 or 2 years to make sure that if they do come in contact with something like HPV or any other sexually transmitted disease, you are going to be able to treat that and treat it successfully.

Cervical cancer is not something that a person is exposed to or the causative agent like human papilloma virus, it is not an exposure 1 month and cervical cancer the next month or 6 months later or 1 year later, or maybe in many instances not even 5 years later. It goes through, thank goodness, a very slow progression, and there is great opportunity to treat at various stages and to treat successfully. But clearly, the earliest detection when there is just a slight abnormality is the best opportunity to treat.

And, of course, with this introduction of this vaccine, which I highly recommend, but not on a mandatory basis and not be forced upon our 11-year-old, as I pointed out, daughters and granddaughters, not my granddaughters, this is wrong. It is the government interfering between the doctor, the parents, and the patient. And it seems to me that it is such common sense that when I introduced this bill; and I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I am soliciting cosponsors, and that list is growing every day.

I want my colleagues to understand that what this bill does is simply state this: If you force your youngsters, your 11-year-olds in whatever State we might be talking about, maybe my own State of Georgia, hopefully they wouldn't do that, but if legislation is passed, and the Governor approves of it, then my bill says the Federal Government will not participate in the cost of those vaccines that are forced on our young children either through the Medicaid program or the SCHIP

program, the childhood vaccination program, the Federal program.

All these are wonderful programs, these safety net programs. I am a very strong advocate of that, of continuing things like SCHIP, to even strengthen it. And, parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, my State of Georgia with their Peach Care program, that is what SCHIP is referred to in Georgia, they have done such a wonderful job of seeking out those children that don't have insurance and covering them, and I commend my colleagues in the Georgia General Assembly, I commend my Governor, Governor Sonny Perdue, for doing such a great job. But I think they would agree with me and they would agree with my friend from New Jersey and my friend from Ohio, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JORDAN, that it is inappropriate expenditure of dollars to take a shotgun approach and force children who have a right to a public education, indeed they are paying for it through their property taxes in most States in this country, and then to say to them you can't enroll in the fifth or sixth grade in middle school because you haven't had this vaccine. It is totally inappropriate. And that is not just this Member's opinion, it is the opinion of all those cosponsors who have signed on to H.R. 1153.

Mr. Speaker, I have got a few charts that I wanted to show. This first one, the American College of Pediatricians and the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons are both opposed to any legislation which would require HPV vaccination for school attendance. We have already talked about the vaccine being approved last June and the studies that were done, and it is approved for females age 9 to 26.

But what they don't know yet, and I have talked to the company that manufactured Gardasil, they say that they really don't know how long the vaccine will last and how much immunity will be given. They think about 5 years, but they are not sure. Maybe it will last longer. Maybe when they do blood studies 5 years later, they will find that the antibody level against this type 16 and 18 HPV virus is high enough that the person doesn't need a booster. But like tetanus shots, of course we know that very typically, the same thing with hepatitis, sometimes these vaccines, the immunity will subside, and the patient is once again at risk, and they will have to get another shot.

So if the vaccine gives immunity for 5 years, and you give it to every single 11-year-old, I would say 99.99 percent of whom are not sexually active, and you spend \$500 either through their own insurance program or out of Mom and Dad's pocket or subsidized through the Federal Government, Medicare, Medicaid; you give them that shot and it lasts 5 years, and let's just assume it wears off by the time they are 16, just about the time that they are falling in love and become sexually active with their boyfriend, and that is the very

time that they need the protection, and the vaccine has worn off, and we have no guidance. At this point we have no guidance.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly the wrong thing to do, and my bill would say that in any situation where this is a voluntary program, an opt-in program, not an opt-out, we don't make parents jump through hoops and go get a notarized signature, or take a half day off work and go to their doctor and maybe have to have paid for a doctor appointment just so they can get a letter signed so their child doesn't have to get this vaccine. That is insanity.

We need to do a good job. We physicians, those of my colleagues who are still practicing, especially my good OB/GYN friends across this country and primary care doctors everywhere, pediatricians need to talk to their parents, talk to their patients and explain that this great vaccine is available, and it has a potential for great good. And I am sure that many, many doses of those vaccines will be sold.

And I hear my colleagues in this body many times bashing the pharmaceutical companies and Big Pharma, and I heard that so much as we were passing the great Medicare prescription drug part D program for our needy seniors back in November of 2003, really beat up on the pharmaceutical industry. But this is a good company, and this should be a profitable product for them. And when they first came out with the vaccine, Mr. Speaker, it was their recommendation, and they worked with State legislators, particularly female State legislators, across the country and said maybe this would be a good idea to have it mandatory in the schools.

But to their credit, after this Governor made it mandatory, not by legislation, but just by rules and regulations in his decision, there was so much public outcry against that that the company now understands that that is not the right way to go, and that is to their great credit. They understand that they have got a great product, but it is not something that should be mandatory. It should be available. It should be available, though, for those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, I am a real strong advocate for a public education. Now, I have a background of going to a Catholic school when I was growing up, but I also have a background of being on a school board in the city of Marietta, Georgia, in Cobb County, my first venture into public service, and I love that public school system. And all my children, adults now, all four, and thank God I am soon to be the father of my seventh grandchild by those four children, went to that public school system, and we loved it. We had friends that either home-schooled their children or went to private school for various and sundry reasons, and I don't argue with that at all. In fact, given the same circumstances, I would maybe have made the same choices.

But I want to see our public schools in this country, in my State of Georgia, in every State, I want to see them thrive and do well. And I firmly believe in the principles of No Child Left Behind, that each and every youngster, no matter where they started in life, that they have that equal opportunity at the brass ring in our public system schools across this country.

□ 2200

But when you start doing things like this, and that is why at the start of the hour, when I said, you know, this might not be a marquis issue like what is going on in the Middle East or global warming or the economy, this is hugely important, because if you force this, if you mandate this in the public school system, you are going to see, you talk about a flight without vouchers to home schooling and to private schooling, and we don't want to see that. I don't want to see that. I want what is best for the youngsters. And I think that we need to keep a hands-off in regard to this.

I have got a few letters here, Mr. Speaker, that I could share. I have got one from a Phyllis Schlaflly with the Eagle Forum who is supporting us on this issue.

I have a letter here from the Concerned Women of America. I will just read the first paragraph. And this is what they say: "Dear friends, CWA, Concerned Women for America, gives kudos to Representative PHIL GINGREY, Republican from Georgia, a former obstetrician gynecologist, on a bill that he plans to introduce. Congressman GINGREY's bill will prohibit Federal funds from being used to implement a mandatory, let me emphasize, a mandatory vaccine program for human papilloma virus, a sexually transmitted disease and a cause of cervical cancer. CWA urges you to call your Member of Congress and ask them not only to co-sponsor this bill, but to take whatever action they can to pass it."

I appreciate that, and it is not for kudos or thanks that I am up here tonight. Mr. Speaker, as we do these Special Orders on both sides of the aisle, people do this because they have a commitment to a cause. And I have a commitment to a cause, and that is the cause of our young people that we make sure that we don't take away the parental right to decide. That is sacrosanct in my mind, and that is why I am here tonight spending this time with my colleagues to try to urge you to sign on to H.R. 1153, and let's do this right.

Once again, as I move to closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that everybody listening in this Chamber and anybody that can hear my voice far and near understands that this bill simply says, if you force it upon our public school children, whatever State we are referring to, then we are not going to pay for that for those children who otherwise can't afford it. But absolutely, if it is appropriately done, and

it is a voluntary program, an opt-in program, and I think parents are smart enough, and certainly young girls, when they get to high school, are smart enough to know that if this is available, they are going to take advantage of it; and to understand that if they don't have insurance, and they can't afford it, that we have these programs, these Federal-State programs like Medicaid and like the SCHIP program, and the Federal childhood vaccination program, so that this opportunity will not be denied to those who need it, as Representative GARRETT pointed out, but we won't be wasting money on those who don't need it and don't want it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will close. And I want to thank my colleagues. I want to thank you for your attention. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, our new Member, Mr. JORDAN, and I want to thank my classmate, Member SCOTT GARRETT from New Jersey, for being with us tonight.

#### TRIBUTE TO JAMES MADISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAGEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the longevity and the genius of our Nation's Constitution and to one of the principal framers of this incredible document, James Madison.

As a member of the Constitutional Caucus, I want to do my part in sharing with people each week here items about the Constitution that we think, in the caucus, are very important.

Madison understood the almost insurmountable task that drafting a Constitution presented to the Constitutional Convention. After the Constitution was completed, Madison looked back at the ideals that were contained in it and marveled that that body as diverse as the Constitutional Convention could have produced a document that did so much to preserve liberty and provide for a form of government that would stand the test of time.

He wrote in Federalist Paper No. 37 that "among the difficulties encountered by the Convention, a very important one must have lain, in combining the requisite stability and energy in government with the inviolable attention due to liberty and to the republican form. Without substantially this part of their undertaking they would have very imperfectly fulfilled the object of their appointment or the expectation of the public."

This founding member of our government knew that there would be a tension between granting maximum liberty to the people and ensuring that the government was given the capacity to execute its critical duties. The greatness of the preamble to the Constitution rests in part in how eloquently and succinctly it enumerates these duties to "establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for

the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.”

Madison wrote: “The genius of republican liberty seems to demand, on one side, not only that all powers should be derived from the people, but that those entrusted with it should be kept in dependence by the people by a short duration of their appointments; and that even during this short period the trust should be placed not in a few but in a number of hands. Stability, on the contrary, requires that the hands in which the power is lodged shall continue for a length of time the same. A frequent change of men will result from a frequent return of electors, and the frequent change of measures from a frequent change of men. Whilst energy in government requires not only a certain duration of power, but the execution of it by a single hand.”

He knew what we take for granted today, one, that liberty is an essential ingredient for stability and prosperity; and, two, that if government does not see its foremost task is to preserve liberty for the people it serves, then it will soon fail.

In discussing the preamble we should pause to take note of the fact that our Constitution was the result, not of monarchical fiat or one man's scheme to craft a new government, but of a Constitutional Convention, a body overflowing with competing philosophies and conflicting viewpoints. But these founders found common ground in our Constitution. Madison was in awe of this reality. “The real wonder,” he wrote, “is that so many difficulties should have been surmounted and surmounted with a unanimity almost as unprecedented as it must have been unexpected. It is impossible for any man of candor to reflect on this circumstance without partaking of the astonishment. It is impossible for the man of pious reflection not to perceive in it a finger of that almighty hand which had been so frequently and signally extended to our relief in the critical stages of the revolution.”

Madison notes that the Convention's end product, our Nation's Constitution, would not have been possible under the normal conditions that prevail in most political bodies. It makes me wonder if such an achievement could ever be possible in today's fractious climate. But Madison chalks this achievement up to two dynamics. He writes: “The first is that the Convention must have enjoyed in a very singular degree an exemption from the pestilential influence of party animosities, the diseases most incident to deliberative bodies and most apt to contaminate their proceedings. The second conclusion is that all the deputations composing the conventions were either satisfactorily accommodated by the final act or were induced to accede to it by deep conviction of the necessity of sacrificing private opinions and partial interest to the public good and by despair of seeing this necessity diminished by delays or by new experiments.”

His observations on the crafting of this great document which establishes our framework for government and secures the blessings of liberties to ourselves and our posterity should serve to remind us of how careful we must be to adhere to the boundaries it creates for the Federal Government. His insight into the process behind the framing of our Constitution might also remind the Members of this body of our duty to serve the people and to maintain, as Madison said, “a deep conviction of the necessity of sacrificing private opinions and partial interests to the public good.”

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PENCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for March 19 through March 20 on account of family medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today and March 21 and 22.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 2007, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

896. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's initial report on the threat posed by improvised explosive devices, as required by Section 1402 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

897. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting on behalf of the Secretary of State and the U.S. Representative to the IAEA, a report detailing assistance to Iran from the International Atomic Energy Agency during calendar year 2006, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2021 note Public Law 107-228 section 1344(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

898. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations and to the Defense Priorities and Allocations System (DPAS) Regulation [Docket No. 061212330-6330-01] (RIN: 0694-AD88) received February 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

899. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — North Korea: Imposition of New Foreign Policy Controls [Docket No. 070111012-7017-01] (RIN: 0694-AD97) received February 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2007-13, Waiving Prohibition on United States Military Assistance with Respect to Chad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Policy with respect to Libya and Venezuela — received February 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

902. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act, pursuant to Public Law 103-160, section 1203(d) of Title XII Public Law 102-511, section 502; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

903. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30523 Amdt. No. 3194] received March 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

904. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30522 ; Amdt. No. 3193 ] received March 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

905. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Societe de Motorisations Aeronautiques (SMA) SR305-230 and SR305-230-1 Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-26102; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-14820; AD 2006-23-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

906. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 40 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26165; Directorate Identifier 2006-

CE-57-AD; Amendment 39-14816; AD 2006-23-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

907. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers R321/4-82-F/8; R324/4-82-F/9; R333/4-82-F/12; and R334/4-82-F/13 Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2006-26220; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-14822; AD 2006-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

908. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Notification of the determination that Haiti meets the eligibility requirements under section 213A(d)(1) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act and that Haiti is meeting the conditions regarding enforcement of circumvention under section 213A(e)(1); (H. Doc. No. —20); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

909. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Supplementary Agreement between the United States of America and Sweden on Social Security signed in Stockholm on June 24, 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 433(d)(1); (H. Doc. No. —21); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

910. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Status Report on the Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 108-7; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1433. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-52 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 802. A bill to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI; with amendments (Rept. 110-54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 327. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop and implement a comprehensive program designed to reduce the incidence of suicide among veterans; with amendments (Rept. 110-55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1284. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2007, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans (Rept. 110-56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 797. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve compensation benefits for veterans in certain cases of

impairment of vision involving both eyes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110-57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 580. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for a 120-day limit to the term of a United States attorney appointed on an interim basis by the Attorney General, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1130. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to extend the authority to withhold from public availability a financial disclosure report filed by an individual who is a judicial officer or judicial employee, to the extent necessary to protect the safety of that individual or a family member of that individual, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1591. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2007 (Rept. 110-61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of March 16, 2007]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1227 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1577. A bill to create a Department of Defense-wide program of patient navigators for wounded members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1578. A bill to establish and monitor medical holdover performance standards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1579. A bill to create a standard soldier patient tracking system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1580. A bill to create a Department of Defense-wide Ombudsman Office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 1581. A bill to improve coordination, implementation, and oversight of United States economic reconstruction assistance for Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 1582. A bill to increase and enhance law enforcement resources committed to investigation and prosecution of violent gangs, to deter and punish violent gang crime, to protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, to revise and enhance criminal penalties for violent crimes, to expand and improve gang prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend the Milk Income Loss Contract Program through fiscal year 2012 at the 45 percent payment rate, to establish a minimum price for Class I milk under Federal milk marketing orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODE, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. HUNTER) (both by request):

H.R. 1585. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1586. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT:

H.R. 1587. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to carry out programs and activities to enhance the safety of levees in the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the offset from surviving spouse annuities under the military Survivor Benefit Plan for amounts paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as dependency and indemnity compensation, to repeal the optional annuity authority for the dependent children of a member when there is an eligible surviving spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Ms.

WOOLSEY, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STARK, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HODES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1590. A bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 1592. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 1593. A bill to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1594. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Hermitage, Pennsylvania, as the Michael A. Marzano Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1595. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Guam War Claims Review Commission; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. KUHLE of New York, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 1596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide and extend tax incentives for renewable energy and conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 1597. A bill to require the FCC to issue a final order regarding television white spaces; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to protect the credit of servicemembers deployed to an overseas combat zone and to facilitate awareness of a servicemember's rights under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1599. A bill to ensure an adequate supply of public health professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. KUHLE of New York, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SHULER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WU, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BART-

LETT of Maryland, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1600. A bill to continue and expand upon previous congressional efforts to ensure an abundant and affordable supply of fruits, vegetables, tree nuts, and other specialty crops for American consumers and international markets, to enhance the competitiveness of United States-grown specialty crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1601. A bill to facilitate the provision of telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1602. A bill to ensure environmental justice in the areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer Federal employee health benefits plans to certain individuals affected by an incident of national significance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. POE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. REYES, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1604. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Embassy of the United States in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, as the "Mickey Leland United States Embassy Building"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATOURETTE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to repeal requirements that applicants for merchant seamen licenses and certificates and merchant mariner's documents must take oaths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a flexibility incentive grant program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by certain individuals born in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, or Thailand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1608. A bill to expand college opportunities by significantly simplifying the Federal student aid application process; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. RENZI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 1609. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the 8(a) program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 1612. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. LINDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide for legal protection against frivolous lawsuits directed at statutes prohibiting picketing at military and other funerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1614. A bill to reform the financing of House elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution encouraging the elimination of harmful fishing subsidies that contribute to overcapacity in commercial fishing fleets worldwide and that lead to the overfishing of global fish stocks; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution honoring the career and research accomplish-

ments of Frances E. Allen, the 2006 recipient of the A.M. Turing Award; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 256. A resolution congratulating Sauk Village, Illinois, on its 50th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H. Res. 257. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

11. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Iowa, relative to Senate Resolution No. 15 opposing the commitment of additional American troops to the war in Iraq; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 19: Mr. BILBRAY and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.  
H.R. 39: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 140: Mr. WEXLER.  
H.R. 180: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 210: Mr. TOWNS.  
H.R. 245: Mrs. CAPITO.  
H.R. 255: Mr. POE.  
H.R. 281: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 327: Mr. SOUDER.  
H.R. 329: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 354: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 406: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 410: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 440: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 450: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 458: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 460: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 500: Mr. GOODE.  
H.R. 511: Mr. TURNER.  
H.R. 563: Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 567: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 579: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. McNERNEY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H.R. 589: Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 623: Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 624: Mr. KIND, Ms. WATERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 628: Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 634: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LoBIONDO, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 654: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 661: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 677: Mr. McNERNEY.  
H.R. 681: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 686: Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. McGOVERN.  
H.R. 691: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 698: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 719: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 728: Ms. KILPATRICK.  
H.R. 731: Mr. GOHMERT.  
H.R. 752: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 769: Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 782: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 790: Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 811: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 887: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 894: Mr. HALL of New York.  
H.R. 896: Ms. BALDWIN.  
H.R. 901: Ms. WATSON.  
H.R. 926: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 988: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 989: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.  
H.R. 997: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1038: Mr. PASTOR.  
H.R. 1061: Mr. EHLERS.  
H.R. 1064: Mr. SRES and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
H.R. 1072: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1076: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 1093: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1097: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1102: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1108: Mr. DOYLE.  
H.R. 1115: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
H.R. 1122: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1135: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1153: Mr. LINDER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1199: Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 1216: Mr. TIAHRT.  
H.R. 1228: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1236: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1240: Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1286: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 1293: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McCOTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1314: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. FOXX, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 1324: Mrs. MYRICK.  
H.R. 1330: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1344: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 1347: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1350: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1353: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 1361: Mr. JINDAL and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.

H.R. 1379: Ms. Linda T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1382: Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 1399: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. POE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr.



MATHESON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SALI, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1414: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1415: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1416: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1419: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1420: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1426: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1427: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1428: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1431: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1433: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1441: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. POE, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1465, Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1474: Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1555: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1533: Mr. WALSH of New York and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1538: Mr. SAXTON and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1551: Mr. HODES and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1555: Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. CLARKE.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. HARE and Ms. CLARKE.

H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Con. Res. 80: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H. Con. Res. 92: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 53: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 137: Ms. WATSON.

H. Res. 121: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PITTS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 179: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 197: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 221: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 224: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 237: Mr. GRIJALVA.